DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 903 LI 001 956

AUTHOR	Simkin, Faye
TITLE	Cooperative Resources Development; A Report on a Shared Acquisitions and Retention System for METRO Libraries.
INSTITUTION	New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency, N.Y.
REPORT NO	METRO Misc-Pub-5
PUB DATE	May 70
NOTE	69p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.55
DESCRIPTORS	*Library Acquisition, *Library Cooperation, *Library Technical Processes, Shared Services, Storage
IDENTIFIERS	*Shared Acquisitions and Retention System, SHARES

ABSTRACT

This report assesses the programs of the Shared Acquisitions and Retention System (SHARES) project during its early phases of development. Emphasis is placed on the limited shared acquisitions and retention programs that SHARES has undertaken during its first year. Recommendations include: (1) development of beginning program of cooperative acquisitions, (2) emphasis on the development of richer resources (shared acquisitions) rather than emphasis of the more negative aspect of loss of infrequently used resources (shared retention), (3) cooperative purchasing of resources, (4) formation of a coordinating committee to advise and guide SHARES in resource development and (5) production of a directory of unique resources available in the metropolitan area. (MF)

ED039903

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Cooperative Resources Development

A Report on a Shared Acquisitions and Retention System for METRO Libraries . . . . by Faye Simkin

New York Metropolitan Reference & Research Library Agency

001956

LI

METRO Miscellaneous Publications Series

No. 3 "Shared Acquisitions and Retention System (SHARES) for the New York Metropolitan area: A Proposal for Cooperation among METRO Libraries," by Hendrik Edelman. (1969)

No. 4 Directory of Members. (April 1970)

No. 5 "Cooperative Resources Development. A Report on a Shared Acquisitions and Retention System for METRO Libraries," by Faye Simkin. (May 1970)

No. 6 "The Medical Library Center: A Cost Study," by Eugene T. Boice, Richard Noble, and Faye Simkin. (May 1970)

METRO Miscellaneous Publication No. 5
May 1970

New York Metropolitan Reference & Research Library Agency
11 West 40th Street / New York, New York 10018

CONTENTS

Preface		v
Chapter 1.	Introduction	1
	History of METRO	1
	Science Project	2
	Edelman Report	2
	Boice Recommendations	5
	Ad Hoc Committee on SHARES	6
Chapter 2.	Shared Acquisitions	7
	Forerunners of SHARES	7
	Cooperative Acquisitions within METRO	8
	General Directions for SHARES	10
Chapter 3.	Implementation of a Shared Acquisitions Program	11
	College Catalogs	11
	United States Government Documents	13
	American Doctoral Dissertations on Microfilm	17
	H. W. Wilson Company Indexes	22
Chapter 4.	Evaluation of Shared Acquisitions Projects	27
Chapter 5.	Shared Retention and Storage	30
	Forerunners of SHARES	30
	Center for Research Libraries	31
	The Medical Library Center	33
Chapter 6.	Implications of a Retention and Storage Program	36
	Center for Research Libraries	36
	The Medical Library Center	38
Chapter 7.	Evaluation of a Retention and Storage Program	40

Chapter 8. Conclusions 44
Specific Directions for SHARES 45
General Recommendations 49

Acronyms 52

Appendices 53

Bibliography 61

METRO Board of Trustees and Staff 63

METRO Member Libraries 64

PREFACE

The concept of a shared acquisitions and retention system for libraries in the New York metropolitan area was first discussed in Dr. Russell Shank's report on regional access to scientific and technical information in 1968. Since that time, a cooperative movement among METRO libraries has been the subject of much study and deliberation, culminating in a grant from the Division of Library Development, the New York State Education Department, Albany, New York. This past year marked the beginning of the tentative steps of SHARES towards the development of a shared acquisitions and retention system.

The cooperative development of resources has been tested in other regions of the country. Prospects for a similar program in the METRO area present exciting prospects and problems. There is probably a greater concentration of resources and libraries with unique holdings in this small area than there is throughout the nation. Experimenting with the concept of cooperative acquisitions and retention will be a challenge here not likely duplicated under similar conditions elsewhere. It is hoped that the initial stages outlined in this survey will emphasize the tremendous potential of library cooperation in the New York City area.

This report is an attempt to assess the programs of the SHARES project during its early phases of development. Emphasis has been placed on the limited shared acquisitions and retention programs that SHARES has undertaken during its first year, in the hope that those embarking on similar schemes may find the selection of material of interest and may profit from our experience.

We are greatly indebted to Hendrik Edelman, Assistant Director, Cornell University Libraries, Ithaca, New York. His report on a proposed shared acquisitions and retention system for METRO was the basis for many of the ideas extracted and developed in this report.

We are most grateful to Eugene T. Boice, Associate Computer Programmer, Division of Electronic Data Processing, New York State Education Department, Albany, New York, for his continued suggestions and guidance during the writing of this report. Mr. Boice, as the original Project Officer for SHARES, initiated many of the proposals expanded here.

The individual members of the Ad Hoc Committee on SHARES were most helpful in devoting their time and energy to developing the concept of SHARES and offering guidance in the selection of material and we wish to acknowledge their contributions. Members of the Committee were Donald C. Anthony (Columbia University), Edward

DiRoma (The New York Public Library), John C. Frantz (Executive Chairman of the National Book Committee), Brother Alexander F. Thomas (Iona College), David R. Watkins (Brandeis University) and Richard H. Logsdon, Chairman (City University of New York).

Also, we wish to thank the METRO staff for their patience and encouragement while this report was in process and Mrs. Ruth Rankin who designed the report. A special word of thanks must be given to Mrs. Dorothy S. Petersen who devoted many hours of meticulous labor to the typing of the report through its various drafts. We are also grateful for the editorial and proofreading skills of Marion L. Simmons, Assistant Executive Director of METRO.

Finally, we would like to thank John M. Cory, the former Executive Director of METRO for his words of encouragement during the writing of this report and for his confidence in allowing us to undertake this venture.

Faye Simkin
Project Officer - SHARES
New York Metropolitan Reference and
Research Library Agency

New York, New York
May 1970

History of METRO

The New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency (METRO) came into being in June 1964 when it was chartered by the Board of Regents of the State of New York "to improve reference and research library services in the New York Metropolitan area by promoting and facilitating utilization of existing resources and by developing additional resources." This brought to fruition discussions which had been carried on for more than twenty years (see Appendix A).

Cooperation among libraries is not a new idea. Interlibrary loans are recorded in 16th century Germany. Here, in the metropolitan area, in 1896 there was a preliminary scheme between Columbia University and The New York Public Library for the development of libraries and the purchase of books. Harvard University had a plan for central storage at the turn of the twentieth century. But there was no real activity involving the New York area until the formation of a New York Metropolitan Committee of Librarians in 1946. In 1947 there followed a proposal for a Northeastern Regional Library. In an effort to reconcile conflicting viewpoints a report on the growth problem in research libraries was prepared in 1952 by Cresap, McCormick and Paget for discussion with trustees of Harvard, Yale, Columbia and The New York Public Library. No unanimity was achieved.

There were various groups concerned with cooperation among college and university libraries on both local and state levels during the 1950's while state-supported systems of public libraries were developing. But it was the work of the Commissioners' Committee on Reference and Research Library Resources which really paved the way for the state-wide scheme known as the 3 R's Program.

After the report of the Commissioners' Committee in 1961 an Ad Hoc Committee of Librarians in New York City representing public, academic and special libraries was formed. They met during 1962 and 1963 and in their second year, with financial assistance from the Council on Library Resources and the Old Dominion Foundation, commissioned Nelson Associates, Inc. to do a study of library resources in the metropolitan area and how they might best be utilized. It was the Nelson proposal for a New York library service authority organized as an independent, non-profit corporation which formed the basis for the agency chartered in 1964 as The New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency (METRO).

Lack of funds meant lean times, but in March of 1966 an additional grant from the Council on Library Resources provided for the formation of a small secretariat.

Also in 1966 the first state appropriation for the 3 R's program was made.

That fall a study of science library resources and needs in the metropolitan area was funded by a grant from the New York State Science and Technology Foundation. A newsletter, "For Reference", was issued, bylaws were approved and late that year a membership meeting was held to discuss proposals for library cooperation.

At the first annual meeting in April 1967 thirty-four member libraries were represented. By the following October program and staff were both expanded and the pioneer project was on its way.

Science Project

The science project funded in 1966 resulted in a report which became No. 1 in the METRO Miscellaneous Publications Series. Authored by Russell Shank, supervisor of the science library project and presently Director of Libraries, Smithsonian Institution, it is entitled "Regional Access to Scientific and Technical Information; A Program for Action in the New York Metropolitan Area."

Shank recommended a new delayed access storage center to house various kinds of little-used material in space less expensive than that of most New York libraries. Since a considerable portion of the older literature in science and engineering is in little demand and of limited usefulness, delays in access of from one to three days are warranted. Thus it is possible that such a center as he envisioned would be consistent with regional needs. He also recommended an acquisitions program for lesser-used materials to be made available throughout the metropolitan area.

Edelman Report

As a result of discussions by acronym-oriented staff and committees the concept of a Delayed Access Storage Center (DASC) was converted to a Shared Acquisitions and Retention System (SHARES). METRO obtained the services of Hendrik Edelman, University Center Bibliographer for the Joint University Libraries in Nashville, to conduct a study of the needs and potential of such a system for the area. He drew upon the experience of special consultants and METRO staff and committee members.

Interviews with member librarians were conducted by Mr. Edelman and METRO staff and committee members during the fall of 1968. Various aspects of the Shank report,

including what at that stage of its evolution was known as a Cooperative Acquisition and Storage Project (CASC), were discussed at a membership meeting. In December a set of preliminary recommendations was presented for consideration and the final report was published in May as Metro Miscellaneous Publication No. 3, "Shared Acquisitions and Retention System (SHARES) for the New York Metropolitan Area: A Proposal for Cooperation among METRO Libraries." Mr. Edelman's major recommendations are reproduced below.

Action Program

A. Project officer

1. METRO should appoint a senior officer to be in charge of the SHARES program and to develop its implications. Initially, he could also be responsible for communications and transportation.

B. SHARES acquisitions programs

1. SHARES should organize a permanent machinery to coordinate acquisitions of specific expensive or bulky purchases among member libraries. Permanent members of this SHARES acquisitions committee should be the selection librarians of the major research libraries and the responsible METRO officer, with invited members of other university and college libraries, public libraries and special libraries if the subject of the materials falls into their domain. Any member of METRO may suggest items for purchase. The decisions of the committee should be published periodically.

2. An evaluation of the many cooperative acquisitions agreements actually in operation will be essential and the results should be incorporated into larger plans. SHARES should stimulate further development of bilateral and multilateral acquisitions agreements in the city.

The committee should also review the various existing and forthcoming major blanket order programs in an effort to eliminate unnecessary duplication through divisions in responsibility.

3. SHARES should stimulate the development of important microfilm projects.

4. SHARES should apply through METRO for funds from New York State, the federal government or from foundations to enable the purchase of materials to be consid-

ered essential for the region or the nation. Such jointly acquired materials will be placed in the most desirable location or in the assigned METRO repository.

5. SHARES should study the necessity of support for specific subject collections in the METRO region. In addition to Shank's recommendations in this respect, special attention should be given to the biochemical sciences, the social sciences and the humanities. Requests for outside financial or organizational support should be developed by SHARES. Emphasis should be placed on those collections which are to be considered of vital regional or national interest and for which the burden of upkeep and servicing becomes too much for the responsible institution.

6. SHARES should develop long range plans with regard to cooperation in acquisitions and possibly cooperative and/or centralized processing. Continued study and exploration will be needed in order to evaluate the problems and possibilities.

C. SHARES retention and storage programs

1. METRO should contract with one or more libraries in its geographical area to take responsibility for the retention of last copies of certain types of material or of material in defined subject areas. This retention network will bring little used materials to those places where its usefulness will be optimal. The general terms of the contracts will call for the need for direct access and interlibrary loan if physically possible. The retention center(s) will receive a fixed amount of money for each title handled. Within the limitations of the contract the materials should become property of the designated retention center.

2. The Medical Library Center of New York has indicated a willingness to assume the role of repository for the METRO area for materials in the medical sciences. For most other subject areas, The New York Public Library should be considered as the most effective possibility. The need and possibilities for the selection of other subject repositories, notably in the fields of law and theology, should be explored as soon as possible.

3. Although no specific data are available, there is an apparent need for repositories for certain types of materials. In this connection The New York Public Library should become the down-state Regional Depository Library for U.S. Government Documents, with possible support through METRO.

4. Through the appropriate agencies SHARES should stimulate discussion of coop-

eration with regional and national networks and centers, notably the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago. Only in such cooperation can the highest degree of efficiency and accomplishment be reached. The possibility of group membership in the CRL should be actively explored, as well as the possibilities for subsidy of such a relationship.

5. SHARES should explore the need for a regionally coordinated plan for preserving in some form deteriorating library materials. Pilot projects should be selected and efforts should be made to fund and launch programs using current technological methods. All this should be in coordination with national developments.

6. In order to alleviate space problems in smaller academic libraries, serving a primarily undergraduate educational program, SHARES should stimulate active weeding and be able to advise librarians on this matter, if desired. There are several possibilities for stimulation, such as the publication of promotional materials, standards, manuals and cost figures, the organization of lectures and workshops and assistance through consultants.

7. A file should be developed of the need for and the availability of stack space for temporary storage. Many libraries have active building programs, but need space for the time being. Regular contact with METRO members will be required in order to keep track of this rapidly changing situation.

Boice Recommendations

Mr. Eugene Boice was appointed Assistant Executive Director of METRO and SHARES Project Officer in May, 1969. His primary task was to sift through the proposals endorsed in the Edelman Report and select those recommendations which could immediately be implemented within limited funds and with library materials already widely held among METRO members. He recommended concentration on one sub-set, the storage, retention, and retrieval of library material in two classes, seldom used materials and U. S. Government Documents. Concurrent with a retention and storage program, Mr. Boice suggested a study of communication and delivery needs, particularly as these services related to the SHARES operation. He urged that each recommendation of the Edelman Report be tested in a live environment, with the freedom to expand or contract the program, revise procedures, and to apply demonstrated progress as the criterion for advancement. Mr. Boice outlined actual procedures for the deposit, retrieval and return of all stored material. In addition to its functional program, the SHARES repository would serve as a testing ground for library cooperation, with

particular emphasis on interdependent storage, retrieval, communication, delivery, duplicate elimination and materials preservation services. Mr. Boice's systematic approach to the organization of a SHARES repository was endorsed by the METRO Board of Trustees in May, 1969.

Ad Hoc Committee on SHARES

The Special Projects Committee of METRO suggested the formation of a Sub-Committee to develop guidelines for the selection of seldom used material for storage. Primary consideration would be given to material for which bibliographic control was readily available thus obviating the need for detailed cataloging, or for which control could be established at minimum cost. Final decision on material to be stored would rest with the contributing agencies.

An Ad Hoc Committee, comprising representatives from the METRO Board and two METRO Committees (Special Projects Committee and Library Use and Resources Committee) was formed in June 1969 to establish guidelines and set directions for the shared retention of library material in the metropolitan area. Members of this Committee were Donald C. Anthony, Associate Director of Libraries, Columbia University; Edward DiRoma, Chief, Economics Division, The New York Public Library; John C. Frantz, Director, Brooklyn Public Library; Brother Alexander F. Thomas, Chief Librarian, Iona College; David R. Watkins, Director of Libraries, Fordham University; and Chairman: Richard H. Logsdon, University Dean for Libraries, City University of New York. Mr. Boice resigned in September, 1969 to return to Albany. Miss Faye Simkin, Mr. Boice's assistant, became project officer.

Forerunners of SHARES

A primary recommendation of the Edelman Report was that "SHARES should organize a permanent machinery to coordinate acquisitions of specific expensive or bulky purchases among member libraries." A METRO-initiated cooperative acquisitions scheme would be an experiment for the member libraries, although the larger academic and research libraries had participated for several years in a number of national plans to coordinate and share acquisitions. A brief examination will be made of some of these well-established plans, through which some area libraries have gained considerably in resources.

Farmington Plan

The Farmington Plan which began in 1947, arose out of the Wartime Cooperative Acquisitions Project sponsored by the Library of Congress, and reflected the needs of American libraries for European publications. The Farmington Plan Handbook, published in 1961, stated the aim of the project: "..... (to) make sure that one copy at least of each new foreign publication that might reasonably be expected to interest a research worker in the United States would be acquired by an American library, promptly listed in the National Union Catalog, and made available for interlibrary loan or photographic reproduction." This plan is administered by the Association of Research Libraries, through the participating libraries who accepted the responsibility for collecting and cataloging material in specific geographic and subject areas. Both The New York Public Library and Columbia University are members of the Plan. Beginning with European acquisitions, the Plan was modified to include African and Asian materials. The deluge of material available soon outgrew the collecting policies of the Plan and other shared acquisitions plans evolved. In later years, the Farmington Plan has concentrated on the need for duplication of significant materials in major libraries.

Public Law 480 Plan

Established in 1961 with Federal support, this Plan evolved from problems in excess foreign currency. Surplus agricultural commodities were sold to countries from which payment would be received in "blocked" local currencies. The Library of Congress began to acquire material from excess currency countries (India, Pakistan, U. A. R., Indonesia, Israel, etc.,) and to deposit such materials in appropriate libraries. Each institution deposited $500 as a participating member and arrangements were made for centralized and cooperative cataloging. Among METRO members, both The New York Public Library and Columbia University receive all P. L. 480 material. Other METRO members specialize in area collections, e.g., New York University (United Arab

Republic) and Yeshiva University (Israel).

Latin American Cooperative Acquisitions Plan

The heretofore neglected acquisition of materials published in Latin American countries was the subject of a series of seminars and negotiations leading to the Latin American Cooperative Acquisition Plan (LACAP). Backed by private enterprise, this Plan was a concerted and cooperative effort to purchase from Latin America, all current imprints on a multiple copy basis. More than thirty libraries including Columbia University and The New York Public Library participate in this program administered by the Stechert-Hafner Company. The publishing company acquires, through field agents, materials which are distributed from its New York office on a general order basis.

ARL Programs

The Association of Research Libraries is responsible for the operation and coordination of several cooperative acquisition programs. Metropolitan New York members include New York University, Columbia University and The New York Public Library. Projects include the Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project, and the Scholarly Resources Development Program. An example of the latter is the program involving the acquisition of materials from China. Much of the material acquired through ARL activities is housed and administered by the Center for Research Libraries. The Center for Research Libraries also acquires for the Cooperative African Microfilm Project. Sponsored by the African Studies Association, the purpose is to acquire, at joint expense, microfilms of expensive or rare Africana for the joint use of participants.

The pattern of cooperative acquisitions has been well established on a national scale with some New York City libraries fully participating. Though primarily concerned with the purchase of foreign materials to enrich the holdings of American libraries, each plan has demonstrated the feasibility of joint action in the purchase of bulky, expensive and not readily accessible materials. The material thus acquired has been centralized in one location or housed in various libraries, suiting the nature of the acquisition to the needs of researchers and scholars.

Cooperative Acquisitions within METRO

Before the advent of METRO, several libraries within the New York metropolitan area were independently engaged in various forms of cooperative activities, including the coordinated purchase of materials. Other regions of mutual cooperation included

access to collections and the maintenance of delivery systems. Group activities include:

Westchester Library System

A scheme for cooperative acquisitions has been evolved among cooperating libraries, delegating subject responsibilities in depth to certain public libraries, e.g. Yonkers (Business), White Plains (History and Government), Mount Vernon (Law) and New Rochelle (Fine Arts). A delivery system, linking all public libraries in Westchester, has been a feature for a number of years.

Academic Libraries of Brooklyn

Academic libraries participating are: Brooklyn College of Pharmacy, Brooklyn Law School, Long Island University, New York City Community College, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, Pratt Institute, St. Francis College and St. Joseph's College for Women. The cooperative acquisition and storage of materials has been much discussed but some of the libraries included in this arrangement are too small and have too limited a base on which to build. Emphasis has been placed on mutual access to each other's collections by students and faculty. Cooperative effort has produced a list of serial holdings in the Applied Science and Technology Index, indicating which institution has the best run of the serials indexed.

Academic Libraries in Lower Westchester

Thirteen small academic libraries comprise this group. Cooperative purchases have been attempted, in the form of acquisitions lists of expensive publications, infrequently used but needed in at least one college in the area. Member libraries vote on the items listed. Again, the lower Westchester college libraries have felt that a broader structure of holdings is necessary for truly successful shared acquisitions.

Shared and selective purchasing arrangements have been in existence for several years among such institutions as The New York Public Library, the New York Academy of Medicine, Columbia University, Union Theological Seminary, and others. Affiliation with METRO has not affected prior programs. However, the smaller libraries recognize the need for a

broader arrangement than can be financed among themselves. The role of SHARES in fostering and encouraging greater scope in cooperative acquisitions will be discussed in the section on future directions for shared acquisitions and retention for metropolitan libraries.

General Directions for SHARES

SHARES was conceived as specified in the application for a grant from the Division of Library Development, New York State Education Department, "to facilitate access to materials which are not now available in the area or cannot, for reasons of space, staff, or funds, be made accessible beyond the individual library's primary audience." As modified by the Ad Hoc Committee, the emphasis was shifted to bringing collections of library material together in currently existing libraries having strength in a particular area. Those libraries willing to accept the responsibility for the maintenance and servicing of such material in exchange for a considerable body of materials would be encouraged. If no home for such materials could be found, SHARES would provide a centralized storage facility for such materials and make them available to the METRO membership. In order to fully test in an actual environment, the Ad Hoc Committee gave highest priority to material for which there existed simple bibliographic control (e.g. government documents). To emphasize the retention aspects of the program, attention was focused on material, probably of a retrospective nature, for which one copy for an entire area would suffice. The more complex problems evolving from title transfers and actual deposits of material were deferred until a substantial body of like material could be brought together as a test. Types of material endorsed for shared acquisition and retention were college catalogs, United States government documents, American doctoral dissertations on microfilm, serials indexed in the H. W. Wilson Company indexes and monographs analysed in the Essay and General Literature Index. Responsibility for establishing procedures for such a program was delegated to the SHARES staff. The selection of each category of material and subsequent handling will be investigated in the next section.

College Catalogs

College catalogs were the first form of material selected by the Ad Hoc Committee on SHARES to test acquisitions and retention on a limited basis. This type of material fell into both extensively used and seldom used categories. Current college catalogs are subject to wide use by students to determine entrance requirements, course descriptions, etc. Once college catalogs lose currency, their use is limited but retrospective catalogs are consulted for past examples of curriculum planning, for biographical information on faculty, for reconstruction of courses and educational requirements by former students, and for a general overview of the changing academic scene.

The SHARES staff designed a questionnaire to gather data from METRO members on the scope of their collections, frequency of use and their desire to contribute to a consolidated collection or to accept responsibility for servicing such a collection. The response indicated that almost all METRO member libraries acquired catalogs selectively, but neither comprehensiveness nor retrospectiveness were goals. The exceptions were the New York Public Library, Columbia University, and Teachers College. The collection at Teachers College formed an integral part of resources on curriculum planning which were needed for regular on-site use by their students. Lack of shelving space precluded any consideration of forming a consolidated collection at that institution.

The Ad Hoc Committee proposed a merger of the retrospective college catalog collections held at Columbia University and The New York Public Library to form as nearly complete a collection as possible. The Annex of The New York Public Library could make space available at a reasonable cost to METRO. Columbia University has expressed an interest in donating their collection of catalogs to a central location, retaining only the past five years. Other members of METRO have indicated their willingness to donate their collections as they passed out of currency.

With space requirements and retrospective scope assured, the Ad Hoc Committee turned its attention to acquiring and housing a comprehensive and current collection of catalogs. A central location was needed, with enough space available for an open shelf reference collection and ready access by students. The New York Public Library has been planning an undergraduate reference and circulating library on the east side of Fifth Avenue diagonally opposite the research library. It is anticipated that this new facility, the Mid-Manhattan Library, will open in the fall of 1970. The Education Library, formerly a section of the Donnell Library Center, will be incorporated into Mid-Manhattan's History and Social Sciences Department. This will be the focal point for a collection of college catalogs, with open shelving for quick access and adequate seating for on-site

use. The Mid-Manhattan Library has agreed to house and service such a collection with some financial support from METRO.

Concluding the agreement with the two cooperating libraries within The New York Public Library, the Ad Hoc Committee formally adopted the following resolution: "METRO will support, at The New York Public Library, a comprehensive collection of college catalogs, including the catalogs of all degree granting institutions, junior and community colleges, and professional and technical schools, using the latest editions of American Universities and Colleges and American Junior Colleges as the basis for inclusion. One copy of each catalog will be designated as an archival copy. The availability of both the current and archival collections will be insured to both METRO members and the general public through on-site access and fee-based photocopying services."

A meeting to work out the actual procedures of acquiring and handling so comprehensive a collection was held directly after the above resolution was adopted. Attending were representatives of the Research Libraries, the Mid-Manhattan Library and the staff of SHARES. The following procedures were developed. The Mid-Manhattan Library, with a form letter, will solicit two copies of all available college catalogs. It is estimated that the range will encompass approximately 4,500 catalogs. As the catalogs arrive, Mid-Manhattan will transfer one copy of each to the Annex of The Research Libraries for the archival collection. Mid-Manhattan will make available on its open shelves, unbound, as complete a current collection as can be secured. As the year of currency passes, the catalogs will be discarded unless desired by the Research Libraries to fill an unexpected gap. The existing retrospective collection, currently housed in the Information Division, supplemented by Columbia University's collection, will be moved to the Annex in the spring of 1970. When this collection is relocated, browsing privileges will not be permitted, but on-site access and photoduplication services will be offered.

Financial Estimates

Financial estimates supplied by the participating libraries for the organization and servicing of this collection of college catalogs are approximately:

Mid-Manhattan Library	$ 4,000
Research Libraries	22,000
Total Cost	$26,000

It is anticipated that the financial requirements will substantially decrease after the

initial year of operation. The amount of square footage to be set aside to house this collection has to be determined before a final cost can be estimated.

Since public use of the consolidated collection will not begin until the fall of 1970 an attempt at an evaluation of potential use cannot be made. Based on the results of the questionnaires, use of current catalogs varies in frequency, from several times a week to half a dozen calls per month. Retrospective collection use is much more limited, generally two or three times a month. This would indicate that college catalogs do indeed fall into the category of little used material, beyond a strong interest in current issues.

Mr. Boice's recommendations emphasized a period of testing for each type of material, with the right to modify or cancel existing arrangements as experience was gained. The Ad Hoc Committee on Shares reinforced this proposal by agreeing to test the viability of a comprehensive collection for at least a five year period, subject to later modifications once patterns of use are clearly established.

United States Government Documents

The Depository Library Act of 1962 made possible the designation of many new depository libraries, authorized the establishment of regional depositories, and enabled existing depositories, after a retention period of five years, to dispose of materials they had formerly been obliged to keep forever. The State Library at Albany began to function as a regional depository on November 14, 1963. The area serviced covered New York State, including Westchester County and Long Island, but excluded New York City. It was felt that New York City with its wealth of libraries and resources, was both too large and too cumbersome for inclusion in a regional system and would impose too great a burden on State Library staff and resources. Consequently, in the absence of a second regional depository all New York City libraries designated as depositories were obliged to keep depository government documents for all time.

United States government documents presented another large body of materials with fixed bibliographic control, held by a substantial number (nineteen) of METRO libraries (see appendix B). In addition, there was a need to consider retention of this material to the point where all downstate depository libraries must keep documents selected by them, regardless of the amount of duplication from library to library. The problems of obligatory retention and proliferation of government documents presented the Ad Hoc Committee with a sizable body of materials that would fall into the retention aspect of SHARES. Some consideration was given to applying for federal designation of METRO as the

regional depository for New York City. This was ruled out since the Economics Division of The New York Public Library already possesses a very comprehensive collection of documents. A SHARES repository would duplicate what already exists. Secondly, the concept of SHARES had been modified to build on existing strengths, not to assemble fresh materials for which no storage arrangements were feasible. The solution lay in extending the function of an existing regional depository system to include the downstate area. Talks were begun with the Newark Public Library, Newark, N. J. and the New York State Library, Albany, N. Y., both functioning regional depositories and both geographically bound to New York City.

At meetings held in Newark and Albany, there were discussions of service to the metropolitan area in the field of government documents which would include assistance in the disposal and transfer of unneeded documents. Adequate safeguards would be necessary to insure that at least one copy of a federal document was retained in the area. It would also be desirable to insure that all documents were available for on-site use in one central location. Most libraries find it more useful to divide their documents into subject classifications and disperse their collections accordingly. Often they are housed in different units, interfiled in the card catalog, and considered as subject acquisitions. The availability of depository documents for interlibrary loan, chiefly through photocopy, was another prime consideration.

The Newark Public Library is the regional depository for the entire state of New Jersey. Their collection of government documents is shelved as a separate collection by Superintendent of Documents classification number. Factors favorable to the selection of Newark as a regional depository included their separate collection, their ability to extend their service without extra staff, and their proximity to New York City. A mutual arrangement between METRO and the Newark Public Library would serve as a prime example of interstate cooperation. Factors against the selection of Newark included its out of state location and its primary responsibility to the City of Newark and State of New Jersey. Moreover, the necessity of financial reimbursement for services rendered would involve the drawing up of a complicated legal contract.

The New York State Library also offered advantages as a regional depository for New York City. The State Library recognized its responsibility to provide service to the entire state and only limitations of time and staff had imposed the exclusion of New York City libraries. If SHARES could assume the workload necessitated by the disposition and transfer of documents, the State could handle the final disposition without financial assistance from METRO. The document collection of the State Library is on a comprehensive scale, including also state and municipal documents.

Disadvantages to the State Library's jurisdiction included the distance from New York City, placing interlibrary loan material within a 7 to 10 day delivery span and making on-site access difficult. Also the State Library has decentralized its collection. This adds an additional time factor to the availability of the material. Another delay would be encountered in the necessity of photocopying documents, since many documents must remain at Albany for the use of state legislators.

Because of the natural geographic designation and the negligible financial assistance, the Ad Hoc Committee determined that cooperation between Albany and SHARES would lead to the desired disposition of documents for New York City libraries. The disadvantages of remoteness from Albany would be countered by providing on-site access in the city to a comprehensive collection of documents. The Economics Division of The New York Public Library has a collection of documents issued since 1956 in microprint available for on-site use. Its central location and completeness has already cast The New York Public Library as the primary document collection in the city.

The Ad Hoc Committee therefore requested that: "the Superintendent of Documents designate the New York State Library as the regional depository for United States government documents for New York City, with METRO serving as the clearinghouse for disposition requests and transfer agreements, insuring that New York City depositories are consulted prior to the transfer of any documents from the area." A meeting was held in October, 1969 of document librarians to inform them of Albany's intention to expand its regional role and of METRO's clearinghouse function. A set of procedures, detailing how the transfer and disposition of requests were to be handled, was presented and approved by the membership. The following resolution was unanimously passed: "The plan for the disposition or transfer of unwanted government documents as outlined by METRO-SHARES and amended by the participants at the meeting is to be presented to the New York State Library at Albany. The State Library will notify the Superintendent of Documents of its intention to serve the downstate area as a regional depository. If the plan is approved, SHARES will assume operation of the clearinghouse on November 1st."

Other issues discussed and decided upon at the meeting were the inclusion of four Westchester county libraries in the SHARES arrangement. Previously these libraries had participated in Albany's regional depository for upstate libraries directly but it was felt that because of their geographical proximity to New York City and their participation in METRO, they would more appropriately be serviced by SHARES. Conversely, it was decided to include those four New York City depository libraries that were not members of METRO since they are included in a specific geographic area. It was also

hoped that this service might serve as an inducement for membership in METRO.

On November 5, 1969, Carper W. Buckley, Superintendent of Documents, notified Mason Tolman, Director of the New York State Library, of his formal approval of Albany's extension of service to include New York City (see appendix C). Letters notifying the United States depository libraries in the downstate area were mailed by the SHARES staff, together with specific instructions on how disposition and transfer requests were to be channeled. SHARES would handle the clerical aspects involved in disposition requests; the depository libraries were to retain the documents themselves until formal notification of disposition was forthcoming from Albany.

The machinery has now been set in motion, but after a three month period, not one single request for the transfer or disposition of a government document has been received in the SHARES office. The State Library plans to issue a follow-up letter to depository libraries in New York City, reminding them of their responsibilities to the regional depository which is now servicing them. A further trial period of three months will be given to ascertain if metropolitan libraries will take the initiative in disposing of government documents they no longer are obliged to retain after five years.

Results, to this date, have proved that there seems to be a reluctance on the part of participating libraries to relinquish material of an often obsolete nature. Now that all depository libraries can be selective in their acquisition of documents shelf and file space may not be a pressing need. Perhaps it is too early to form conclusions; a thorough weeding of government documents material may be made by those academic, public, and special libraries during the slower summer months, and a longer testing period may be desired. It is also possible that most government documents held by member libraries are now in microform and the need to discard is no longer of major importance. A further study is indicated of why a sizable body of materials, that were becoming a problem of bulk and obsolescence, no longer poses a problem.

Due to the lack of action in the exchange of federal documents, no statistics of use can be indicated. Lack of knowledge of actual use precludes any accurate estimate of the funding of the SHARES clearinghouse. A very modest expenditure was estimated, covering the costs of office supplies, postage, and the part time services of a staff assistant. The actual funding required to serve a documents exchange center will have to await determination of the data acquired by a clearinghouse in full operation.

American Doctoral Dissertations on Microfilm

The cooperative acquisition of American doctoral dissertations on microfilm, published by University Microfilms, was next considered by the Ad Hoc Committee on SHARES. This proved to have the most far reaching implications and be the most involved and expensive form of shared acquisitions investigated. Falling into the category of seldom used materials, there was a need to coordinate purchase of dissertations to avoid widespread duplication or complete lack of accessibility, except at the user's own expense. Although needed by graduate and advanced undergraduate research, the collections of dissertations in the New York City area indicated an unsystematic collecting policy.

Results of the SHARES questionnaire sent out to member libraries indicated that the local acquisition of doctoral dissertations was very haphazard. Of interest primarily to academic libraries, their purchase by an institution was usually based on a special request from a faculty member or student. Often, the purchase of either a microfilm or xerographic copy was financially supported by the researcher, with the university serving only as the purchasing agent. Most academic libraries have a good collection of house dissertations, those written by their own doctoral candidates, usually in xerographic or typescript form. Only two libraries reported a systematic approach to the acquisition of doctoral dissertations.

Columbia University purchases about three hundred dissertations a year, with the criteria for acquisition being the requests of students or faculty. In addition, special libraries within the Columbia University system purchase the entire output of dissertations from University Microfilms in their own subject area e.g. library science, Far Eastern materials. No accurate measure of actual student use of dissertations can be ascertained since the microfilmed dissertations are often housed with other microformed material and specific statistics on the use of theses are not maintained.

The Research Libraries of The New York Public Library makes the only other large scale acquisition of microfilmed dissertations. Copies of Dissertation Abstracts International are routed to the Division Chiefs as a selection tool on a subject basis. When the dissertation has been acquired and processed it is sent to the respective subject division and is listed in the public catalogs with other materials. There is no attempt made to file separately the entire collection of dissertations, or to collect them in one location. Again, no specific statistical information can be ascertained about frequency of use, since the dissertations are not segregated from other forms of material.

This dispersed and infrequently used body of material came to the attention of the Ad Hoc

Committee. There was no systematized collection policy in the New York area and holdings were difficult to ascertain. The greatest stumbling block to insuring reasonable access time to a dissertation, regardless of location, was the delivery time in obtaining a microfilm dissertation from University Microfilms. After an initial order had been placed with them in Ann Arbor, Michigan, a six to eight week wait followed. A dissertation is often a vital part of research and a waiting period of six to eight weeks usually precludes the use of an essential source of information. This lengthy period was not applicable to New York City only. It proved to be the normal condition for most East Coast universities (i.e. Yale University).

University Microfilms is well aware of this inordinate length of time but a number of factors account for the delay. The lag is partially due to the time required for producing microfilmed or xerographic copies from the reels stored in University Microfilms vaults. Copies are made only when specific orders are submitted. Publishing by demand and by single order is an unavoidable handicap. In addition, other factors that seem to slow up delivery include processing orders and delivery through the United States mail. Erroneous ordering information received from users compounds the issue.

The Ad Hoc Committee recognized the need for both a stronger and more systematic collection of dissertations in the METRO area and for the availability of a more rapid processing and delivery system. Priorities were established for the investigation of the costs of acquiring a dissertation bank in the New York City area if University Microfilms could not guarantee more rapid access to their output, i. e. acquisition of material in 3 to 5 days. Dissertations also fit into the concept of material already subject to close bibliographic control. Dissertation Abstracts International could serve as an index to a comprehensive dissertation collection. It was hoped that such a collection could be located centrally, providing on-site access, interlibrary loan facilities, and photocopying privileges.

Preliminary talks were arranged between representatives of University Microfilms and the SHARES staff, on the feasability of a blanket order of dissertations for the METRO libraries or, preferably, more rapid service from University Microfilms. The company stated that it would not be averse to a dissertation bank in the METRO area and welcomed the opportunity to meet with the Ad Hoc Committee to discuss improvements in access.

A meeting was held in November, 1969, attended by Mr. Stevens and Mr. Farr of University Microfilms and members of the Ad Hoc Committee. To this meeting were also invited a group of METRO reference librarians who are on the front line of meeting student needs and thus could give a valuable point of view on the need for a collection of

dissertations in the metropolitan area. The meeting proved a fruitful exchange of ideas between the company and the academic community, leading to an understanding of each other's problems and to a promise of greater cooperation in the future. The representatives of University Microfilms outlined a new plan to speed up the processing and delivery of doctoral dissertations to a period of within a week. They were studying the entire operation with a view to separating the dissertation program from other microfilm projects. By isolating the dissertations program, assigning a separate staff to process orders, and insuring overall supervision, a reduction in turnabout time could be achieved.

If the efforts of University Microfilms do not lead to the desired results, the Ad Hoc Committee posed several solutions to making dissertations readily available in this area. Proposals included:

1. Persuasion of Xerox (parent company) to set up an East Coast processing and service center.

2. Establishment of a comprehensive and complete collection of American doctoral dissertations on microfilm -- a bank in the METRO area. A large financial grant would be necessary for such an undertaking.

3. Purchase of a one year output of doctoral dissertations on a trial basis.

4. Assignment of subject responsibilities to participating libraries with METRO providing some financial support.

5. Assignment of subject responsibilities to the New York State Interlibrary Loan Network (NYSILL) since they currently operate on a subject referral basis. All participating libraries are METRO libraries, with the exception of Cornell University. State funds might be a possibility.

6. Formation of a dissertation collection with what already exists in METRO libraries, with members contributing their holdings to a consolidated collection, maintained and funded by METRO.

7. Purchase dissertations in a unique and relevant subject area for which a selection tool already exists (e. g. Earle H. West's Bibliography of Doctoral Research on the Negro; 1933-1966, Ann Arbor, 1969) to test use of a specific field once accessibility has been guaranteed.

These proposals present a number of alternatives, some viable and some outside the financial means of the METRO membership for some years to come. A Xerox processing center on the East Coast, with guaranteed delivery within 48 hours, would be the ideal solution. Discussions on the highest level would have to be initiated with the parent company of University Microfilms, the Xerox Corporation. An East Coast operation would not solve the problem of on demand publishing or single orders which must be photographed and processed from microfilm reels. The financial outlay for either a microfilm or hard copy dissertation would still fall on the user in most instances. Although this is not an overwhelming burden, a user would need to pay from $4.00 to $8.00 to gain access to information he needs. This seems an unfair arrangement, since researchers have access to other types of material, including very expensive microform sets, on a free and unrestricted basis.

The establishment of a comprehensive and complete collection of doctoral dissertations - a dissertation bank - in the New York City area to serve library users at a minimal cost would ease the financial strain on the user but impose a severe financial burden on participating libraries. Neither METRO nor the member libraries could afford the cost of a dissertation bank. Estimates for such a collection, from 1938 to date are:

160,000 dissertations (at 1-1/4 cents per page - minimum $3.00)	$560,000
Back numbers of Dissertation Abstracts for 60 METRO member libraries Vol. I - XXVI, 1938-1966 at $484 each	29,040
	$589,040

Although many libraries have current subscriptions to Dissertation Abstracts, since it would serve as the bibliographic tool to the bank, it seems reasonable for METRO to insure completeness in all member libraries. A substantial discount is also offered with multiple subscriptions.

The figure of $589,040 (which does not include staffing, shelving, and servicing) is beyond the financial resources of this area. Indications are that considerable foundation support is vital to set up so expensive a retrospective collection. Yale, Harvard, and other large academic institutions in the East may be willing to lend their support to such an enterprise. University Microfilms has theoretically given its permission for the establishment of a dissertation center, but serious questions of permission to photocopy arise. The question of seriously undercutting the work of University Microfilms, after

long support by the Association of Research Libraries, also remains.

The acquisition of a one-year output of doctoral dissertations involves the following sums:

Purchase (20,000 dissertations at 1-1/4 cents per page - minimum $3.00)	$70,000
Dissertation Abstracts (1 at $75 and 60 at $40)	2,475
	$72,475

Although significantly reduced in cost, a one year purchase places severe limits on needs and use. Patterns of use in dissertations are difficult to establish but it would appear unlikely that currency is an overwhelming need. Used for research, a retrospective collection would likely be a more necessary purchase.

If financial support could be found for the initial purchase of a complete dissertation bank, METRO might sell dissertations at cost plus one dollar to a user. The advantage to the user would be instant access to the needed dissertation. The profit derived could be used to purchase additional copies. A revolving fund would guarantee immediate access and generate replacement orders. This plan might well operate if U. M. could guarantee immediate reproduction of their master reels, a problem not yet resolved.

The consolidation of a collection of existing dissertations in METRO libraries presents another possibility. Member libraries could contribute their holdings to a pool, maintained and funded by METRO. Some disadvantages include the possibility of excessive duplication, the difficulty of maintaining both a microform and hard copy collection, and the reluctance of libraries to surrender dissertations authored by their own doctoral candidates. The complete collections associated with a particular graduate school (e.g. Columbia-Library Science) or arranged by subject usefulness (e.g. New York Public Library) might pose a problem in attempting as complete a collection as possible.

Since the only sizable collections of dissertations that now exist in the metropolitan area are arranged by subject, the most viable solution may exist in the assignment of subject responsibilities to subject collections. A good collection now exists at Columbia and The New York Public Library and additions to their holdings, partially funded by METRO, may prove to be the foundation from which a dissertation bank may grow. Similarly, using the subject arrangement, the participating libraries in the New York State Interlibrary Loan Network (NYSILL) are organized on a subject referral basis. They are used as back-stopping libraries for interlibrary loan requests from libraries

in New York State. All but one library in the NYSILL network are members of METRO. The exception is Cornell University, a member of the South Central Research Library Council.

Back-stopping subjects include theology and law, areas not normally covered by the strongest dissertation collections within METRO. Because of their use by the entire state as a last point of referral, funding might be a combination of METRO/State support. This would appear to be the most satisfactory financial arrangement, of benefit to all users of dissertations in New York State. Ease of interlibrary loan is the goal of the NYSILL network, and dissertations fall naturally into that sphere.

To test the feasibility of a dissertations bank and a measurement of likely use, a test purchase of one or more relevant and vital area of dissertations may be the quickest means of proof. The bibliography on the Negro compiled by Earle H. West would provide a test of the use of a specific field once accessibility has been guaranteed.

Total number of dissertations	930
Cost of xerographic copies	$11,072.45
Cost of microfilm	3,572.15

If funding can be arranged, SHARES recommends the use of the West bibliography and a selected group of similar relevant material as a pilot project before dissertations are implemented on a wider plan. The use of the NYSILL network appears to be the most logical plan, and would provide access to seldom used materials by the greatest variety of users. The purchase of a partial or complete collection of dissertations will prove a significant step forward into both the areas of cooperative acquisitions and retention of little used materials. This body of library materials provides the greatest variety of experimentation and the most likely potential for any future sharing of materials.

H. W. Wilson Company Indexes

Periodical Indexes

A union catalog of serial holdings for the member libraries of METRO was briefly considered by the Ad Hoc Committee on SHARES. The resources of New York City libraries are virtually all-inclusive in both scope and variety so that it may safely be assured that almost every existing serial can be found somewhere in the metropolitan area. The

geographical proximity of these libraries to each other and the use of tools such as the National Union Catalog of Serials, the SUNY and CUNY union lists, insure that either a telephone call or a check in a bibliographic tool will provide information readily on location and serial runs. For these reasons, the production of another union list was not of primary importance.

The Ad Hoc Committee determined that what was needed was a guaranteed centralized location for a standard list of serials, most commonly used by students. The indexes published by the H. W. Wilson Company comprise the most widely held and used bibliographic works in both public and academic libraries. Two goals were set forth: the bringing together of the Wilson indexes with the periodicals indexed and a finding list of serials, giving a key to one or two locations for each serial. The first phase is limited to the nine indexes analyzing only serial titles. On-site access and photocopying privileges would be assured.

A central repository with unlimited access was sought. The Mid-Manhattan Library has acquired a wide cross section of Wilson indexed periodicals (see appendix D), so that when the new library opens to the public in late 1970, it will provide a central location for on-site reference use. With some financial assistance from METRO, a virtually complete collection could be insured to meet student needs if a periodical is not available in their local library. Member libraries might be persuaded to pool their own resources to fill in gaps in the Mid-Manhattan collection. Locations would be indicated for those periodicals falling outside Mid-Manhattan's subject range e. g. art, law.

A priority was also established for a listing of not only where a serial has been indexed but also for the period of time indexed. A large task faced the SHARES staff - a compiling of a master list of approximately 2000 titles, describing indexing variations. Standard guides to periodicals, such as Ulrich's Guide to Periodicals give data on where a serial is indexed but do not cover the time factor of when such a serial was indexed. An advertisement in the Bulletin of the American Library Association of March, 1969, uncovered the information that the Pierian Press of Ann Arbor, Michigan was undertaking the project of compiling a master list of indexed serials, with a view to publication.

The editor of the Pierian Press was contacted and a sample of the firm's indexing technique was sent to the SHARES staff. Their purpose is publication of a guide to one hundred and sixty-five years of indexed periodicals, beginning in 1802. In addition to the Wilson indexes, other services to be analyzed included Poole's Index, Canadian Periodicals Index, Catholic Periodicals Index, and some major British indexes. The publication will outline major features such as indications of where periodicals are indexed,

showing dates indexing began and/or ceased and will note all indexing irregularities. The aim of this publication, as stated in their advertisement, is to serve the librarian as a selection tool for acquiring periodicals on microfilm versus bound copy, a basis for selecting material which will be heavily used, and a basis for determining the retention value of back runs.

A decision was made by the SHARES staff to halt the indexing already begun and to await the publication of the Pierian Press master index. It was anticipated that an unnecessary duplication of labor would be forestalled and that their master list could be used as a basis for indicating one or two locations of complete runs of serials in the metropolitan area. The Pierian Press has encountered various editorial delays and has not yet seen the project through its final stages. Delay in the arrival of the Pierian Press publication has posed a dilemma to the SHARES staff. The serial holdings of both the Mid-Manhattan Library and The New York Public Library's Research Libraries have been compiled but need to be compared and checked against the Pierian Press listings. The goal has been to include hard copies of serials whenever possible, supplemented by microform sets. The magnitude of the task, particularly if indexing must be done locally, is formidable but could be accomplished by utilizing considerable man hours. Transcribing the material assembled to computer form would be a logical development.

The concept of a collection of the most frequently used periodicals remains valid. Access beyond a student's first point of reference, his own library, would be guaranteed, as would photocopying facilities. A student conducting research involving serials would be assured of a collection that would encompass a universe of serials within prescribed limits. Long range plans for this collection have wider implications, for a data base would be assembled from which other indexing functions could be enlarged. Given a data base including title and publication information, where and when indexed, and information on ceased, changed, merged or superseded serials, coupled with a location for all such publications within the metropolitan area, a valuable tool can be established. Development of a centralized bibliographic data bank, utilizing computers, would provide great economy and usefulness. Designed for a single system, such a data bank would be versatile enough to be enlarged to envelop a network of regional libraries. The Union Catalog of Medical Periodicals, developed by the Medical Library Center of New York is a notable example of how a single system data bank has grown to serve medical and health libraries outside its immediate vicinity.

Major indexing and abstracting services can be linked together to provide both an immense data bank and a finding list wherein indexed serials and monographs may assure readers of positive locations and runs. Supplementing the Wilson Indexes and other

services primarily used by undergraduates, more complex tools, i.e. Publications of the Modern Language Association, Chemical Abstracts, Engineering Index, etc. can be added. Telephone (local) and TWX (out-of-town) services could supplement this data bank on the rare occasions when holding information for serials is not included in the list.

Although SHARES can make only a modest beginning in the collection of indexed material, the long term goal of a complete serials data bank must be always kept in sight. Linkage in an existing and successful serials listing i.e. Union Catalog of Medical Periodicals or the CUNY List would be the least expensive and most beneficial end for total referral and reference use in the metropolitan area.

Essay and General Literature Index

Another major H. W. Wilson publication, the Essay and General Literature Index, was selected as an appropriate test of shared acquisitions. The Ad Hoc Committee envisioned a complete collection of monographs, primarily in the field of the humanities, that could be assembled in one place in the METRO area. Beginning in 1900, the Essay and General Literature Index includes listings of many out of print monographs that still have research value. Gradually being reprinted by Books for Libraries and other publishing firms, much of the early material is still difficult to locate. Too often, a student tracks down a reference in the index only to discover that the monograph itself is unavailable in his library and there are no indications of where his research needs may be filled.

Procedures to determine where a sizable collection of monographs indexed in the Essay and General Literature Index might be located were worked out by the SHARES staff. Because so many of the materials for acquisition and retention were being designated in the Research Libraries and the Mid-Manhattan Library of The New York Public Library, a decision was made to preferably locate the monographs in a public library system in the metropolitan area, where borrowing privileges, interlibrary loan, on-site use, and photocopying use could be undertaken. Random samplings of monographs listed in both very early and more recent editions of the Essay and General Literature Index were checked against the union catalogs of the Brooklyn Public Library and Queens Borough Public Library. Both libraries were found to include in their current holdings approximately eighty percent of all monographs indexed. Also, the Brooklyn Public Library maintains a standing order with Books for Libraries for each of the reprints published by that firm.

If one of the public library systems, i.e. Brooklyn or Queens Borough were willing to become the center for a controlled set of monographs analyzed in the Essay and General Literature Index, access for all students would be readily available. With minimal financial support from METRO, the library system selected could assume current and future responsibility for the development and maintenance of this collection. As in the case of the other Wilson indexes, the Essay and General Literature monographs could form a small part of a much greater development. A computerized master list would be a worthwhile guide in book selection and discarding as well as a potential base from which to indicate holdings of titles analyzed in the Essay and General Literature Index.

The action program outlined in the Edelman Report made six recommendations regarding a proposed SHARES acquisitions program. To evaluate the current status of that portion of the SHARES program, an analysis and comparison of each of Mr. Edelman's proposals will be outlined. In the eight months of operation, including a change in direction of the program and a change in project officer, many of the suggestions for action have been postponed for future development, or modified to some extent.

The greatest need emphasized by Mr. Edelman was the further study of cooperative acquisitions agreements, either potential or in existence. The SHARES staff seconds this suggestion but the exigencies of time and lack of personnel have postponed this aspect of the report. The report on future recommendations for the continuation of the SHARES project will re-emphasize this major need. Not enough investigation into all aspects of true cooperative acquisitions has been undertaken - a vital step if resources for the metropolitan area are to continue to grow and if financial arrangements are to be kept minimal.

Turning to Mr. Edelman's specific recommendations, the major suggestion is for SHARES to "organize a permanent machinery to coordinate acquisitions of specific expensive or bulky purchases among member libraries." A permanent machinery has not been developed, although the members of the Ad Hoc Committee have acted as a guide and impetus for the consideration of certain types of material. A step in the direction of bulky purchases, has been taken in provision for a comprehensive collection of college catalogs in one place for all New York area users. By coordinating the solicitation of catalogs from colleges and universities and providing housing and on-site use, a substantial body of material will be gathered together, relieving other METRO institutions from unnecessary duplication beyond their immediate needs.

The discussions evolving around the establishment of a dissertation bank in the metropolitan area have had, as their basis, the coordination of acquisitions of expensive material. Planning is still in the formative stage. Doctoral dissertations on microfilm represent a costly financial outlay in return for a wealth of material that no one institution could hope to purchase. A partial test of purchase of a subject field should be undertaken to determine statistically the amount of use such a collection would receive and the feasibility of successfully expanding and housing a cooperative purchase of this size.

As his second point, Mr. Edelman asks for "an evaluation of the many cooperative acquisitions agreements in operation... SHARES should stimulate further developments...." Indications have been given in this report that some cooperative acquisitions agreements do exist within the METRO membership and progress should be made on determining the extent of such agreements, how they can be coordinated through committee and clearinghouse activities, and how division for collection building responsibilities (particularly in

purchase of expensive or bulky materials) can be arranged through member libraries. Any scheme of cooperative acquisitions must be carried out with great tact. All librarians pride themselves on their selection policies and the right to determine their own needs. It is only through close cooperation and diplomacy, in actually working with librarians on their native grounds, that confidence in the cooperative effort, SHARES, can be gained. Once this essential approval is won, committees can be appointed, lists of purchases can be determined and exchanged, and a true shared acquisitions program can be developed.

"SHARES should stimulate the development of important microfilm projects." The Center for Research Libraries in Chicago, described in the next chapter, has made a good start in this direction, with the encouragement of the Association of Research Libraries. This phase of the SHARES acquisitions program will be outlined more fully later. Here it is only necessary to state that preservation of material goes hand in hand with acquisition of material. The coordination of area resources implies that materials unique to that area (e.g. local newspapers, local history) must be preserved, in most cases through microfilming of deteriorating materials. International joint efforts, e.g. microfilming of rare African and Chinese archives, etc. must be investigated for the possibilities of cooperative acquisitions on a regional or national scale.

Mr. Edelman emphasizes, as his fourth point, the need for federal, state, or foundation grants to enable SHARES to purchase essential but costly material for use on a statewide basis. New York State has already divided its NYSILL network members into strong subject areas. Many expensive or bulky resources are seldom used but should be available in a suitable location for all those who need them. The division of collection responsibilities, particularly in infrequently used materials, transcends the local level and necessitates close coordination of acquisitions among New York State's 3 R's systems (Reference and Research Library Resources). A division of financial responsibility implies the greatest use of material by the greatest number of people with the least cost.

The prospect of financial aid on the federal level looks bleak when sought for the enrichment of local resources. METRO's cooperation with existing national networks is essential for any federal backing. An intensive study of METRO's relationship with these networks is advised, both as one system in a giant network and as a unique system of library resources which can contribute a great deal to a national resources program. For the activities of SHARES in establishing unique but costly shared acquisitions programs, e.g. American doctoral dissertations on microfilm, financial assistance from foundations appears mandatory.

As its fifth point, the Edelman Report urges attention be paid to specific subject collections in the METRO region, e.g. social sciences, humanities, and the biochemical sciences. A subject collection in a unique field may be appropriate to a given library, but totality of collection building may be beyond that library's own budget or space. It is here that SHARES can play a role as a middleman in supplementing, in terms of finances or housing, many regional resources. Decentralized collections, building from already existing strengths, can be constructed to work smoothly if there is a point of control and coordination. Knowledge of area strengths by subject and close planning and cooperation are essential if users are to become aware of the wealth of material available for their needs.

"SHARES should develop long range plans with regard to cooperation in acquisitions and possibly cooperative and/or centralized processing. Continued study and exploration will be needed in order to evaluate the problems and possibilities." This last recommendation of the Edelman Report on the SHARES acquisitions program is restated fully because of its significance. The emphasis on continued study and exploration is of primary importance. One should not build a house without close scrutiny of the blueprints, the quality of the building materials, the size of the site and its relationship to neighboring sites. Just so, cooperative activities in cataloging, acquisitions, or retention and storage must be studied thoroughly, from the ground up, in order to insure the best investment of time, money, and skills. Long range plans are needed but not before close attention is given to the materials and resources available at first hand.

It is necessary to continue the ongoing experiments in cooperative acquisitions that have been implemented by SHARES even though there is a lack of statistics on use. Nor can financial estimates be made since projects have not come along far enough to estimate accurately the actual costs of servicing. Since use will determine costs in many cases, e.g. government documents exchange, assessments of the financial assistance required are impossible to project at this point. In some instances, actual cost figures have been worked out, e.g. college catalog collection, but only study of its use will determine whether this is or is not a financially feasible undertaking. A modest start on a dissertation program is urged, so that the data on use versus costs can be studied. The Wilson Indexes project, to insure complete representation, will require an additional financial outlay. The exact amount will need further investigation. SHARES will need at least another year to test and evaluate the ongoing programs, to assess the financial implications, and to determine if the courses chosen have always been the wisest.

Cooperative retention and storage programs are the other side of the coin of cooperative acquisitions. Successful endeavours, such as the Medical Library Center of New York and the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago, both began as pure storage facilities but have found that cooperative acquisitions have become important aspects of their programs. A brief description of existing retention and storage programs will be given to illustrate their purpose and ramifications.

The New England Depository Library

This joint storage facility, begun in 1942, was one of the earliest efforts to solve common problems of inadequate shelving for "overflow" materials. Composed of twelve members (Harvard, Massachusetts State Library, Boston Public Library, etc.) a separate facility was constructed in an out-of-the-way but accessible location. The operating expenses for this nonprofit corporation were defrayed by charging member libraries for rental space. It was found that the revenues raised from rentals far exceeded actual operating costs. Beginning with land awarded as a gift and a construction loan of $215,000 from Harvard, the New England Depository Library has been successful in reducing its initial cost through its use of space. Rental space is used by the members for their overflow collections and they maintain the right to deposit in their own space whatever they wish. There is no overall policy governing the type of material deposited; so there has been little success in avoiding duplication. This joint depository has not led to cooperation on any other level. A spatial problem was solved but individual libraries determined their own policies of "selective retirement" of materials. The Cresap, McCormick, and Paget report on The Growth Problem in Research Libraries of the Northeast, pointed out that one of the most interesting features of the program was that Harvard applied criteria to current acquisitions to segregate little used materials for storage (about 25%).

There are other examples of book warehouses of this type but lack of time to study other projects has prevented closer investigation. This aspect of storage, including types of shelving used and determination of "selective retirement" policies, must be studied, not only for the requirements of SHARES but as an aid to METRO member libraries. A referral facility on guidelines for storage of library materials, whether centralized or decentralized, must be developed by SHARES.

Retention and Storage within METRO

Within METRO, a brief description will be given of two retention and storage facilities maintained by The New York Public Library as an example of one institution's attempt

to cope with the sheer abundance of printed matter. The Central Reserve collection of the Branch Libraries is a collection comprising about 230,000 volumes. The collection is chiefly composed of three types of material. Once popular books are kept beyond their currency in one location to fill a reader's request. Assurance is made that at least one copy of this infrequently used material is available somewhere within the branch library system. Another category of material housed within the Central Reserve collection is the more academic and more expensive material, which should be available somewhere to the public, but which would not find its greatest potential housed on the shelves of a branch library. The Central Reserve collection also acts as a backstop for subject referrals and, through interbranch loan, supplements the needs of readers beyond their primary source. Adult, young adult, and children's books are maintained in these categories. The Central Reserve collection receives an annual budget to purchase special or unique books to supplement the acquisitions of the branches. In addition, a policy of sending last copies to Central Reserve insures some measure of control on the retention and storage of materials whose use in the future will decrease. With the opening of the new Mid-Manhattan Library, the preservation of last copies and the housing of scholarly material will be the responsibility of this subject-oriented library.

The Annex at 521 West 43rd Street of the Research Libraries of The New York Public Library occupies six stories of 30,000 square feet, with a basement of 25,500 square feet of usuable space. Serving as a warehouse for the Research Libraries, the collection houses bulky materials (newspapers) in microform or original copy, stores material infrequently requested (approximately 550,000 volumes) and maintains and services collections in special subject fields (patents). Access to this collection is through direct use by the public. Infrequently requested materials are sometimes delivered to the main library for use. Those portions of the Annex not used by The New York Public Library are rented to commercial firms. A coordinated policy for material to be retained and stored in the Annex is carried out and enables The New York Public Library to strengthen its role as a repository of recorded knowledge.

Center for Research Libraries

The Center for Research Libraries, a non-profit corporation, began operation in 1949 as the Midwest Interlibrary Center. Drawing membership from large university libraries located in the Midwest, its immediate concern was cooperative storage of seldom used materials by deposit of member libraries. The stated purpose of the deposit program was to "help ease the space problems in the member libraries by enabling them to deposit in the Center those materials from their collections that are infrequently

used but that are important for research and must continue to be readily available when required." Membership was originally restricted to academic libraries in close proximity to Chicago as an assurance of adequate service to its members. With the expansion of the Center's facilities and original goals, membership now ranges from the University of British Columbia to the University of Rochester. Smaller libraries were, and still are, excluded as it was felt that the services offered by the Center were not relevant to them; nor would they be capable of the required financial support.

The Center is governed by a Board of Directors composed of the Center's administrator, in an ex-officio capacity, and fifteen directors elected for a staggered period of five years from the Council. The Council is made up of two representatives from each member library and they are charged with duties such as the determination of standards for membership, budget approval, dues structure, and election of the Board of Directors.

The Center has two classes of membership. Bona fide members must maintain libraries having at least 500,000 volumes and must have spent an average of $200,000 per year for the last five years on library books, periodicals, bindery, etc. Associate memberships are available to those libraries not meeting the above qualifications. Membership fees are determined annually by a complicated formula. Varying from year to year, fees are based on the relationship of the member's average book budget for the most recent five year period to the budget approved by the CRL Council for the current fiscal year. First class associate members are billed at one-half of the rate of full members. Second class associate members are billed for one-half of one percent of their average book budget for the five year period.

Material deposited in the Center for storage was defined by category, but wide latitude was permitted in the retention of ownership. Although material was accepted for deposit only from members, interlibrary loan privileges were unrestricted. At the outset, four categories of ownership of deposited material were defined; transfer of title to the Center, retention of title not subject to recall (permanent loan), retention of title subject to recall (temporary loan), and temporary storage. The volume of deposits over the years has caused a space problem and has resulted in the restriction of deposits to the first two categories. Additional space has been acquired through rental and a building program is progressing but it seems unlikely that the restrictions will be rescinded.

A wide range of material has been defined as suitable for deposit in the Center's collection. New acquisitions are described in the Center's monthly newsletter and a brief description of each category of items appears in the Center's handbook. Additional

guidelines have been established for the acceptance of material for storage. A catalog card must accompany each item deposited. Since the emphasis is placed on limited processing, and the Center could probably not function adequately if it were required to recatalog all of the deposited material, it is essential that use be made of member-supplied bibliographic data. It was also felt that material not considered valuable enough to be cataloged by the original owner is not of sufficient importance to justify its deposit. Exceptions to this rule include material such as college catalogs and foreign doctoral dissertations which are easily shelf cataloged. Material duplicated in the depository collection as well as material known to be widely held is also excluded.

The Center has gradually established an acquisitions program to the point where original purchases will overshadow material deposited by members. Acquisitions have so far been concentrated in the area of seldom used materials, e.g. foreign doctoral dissertations, acquired by exchanging subscriptions to American periodicals. Strong emphasis has been placed on original microform projects, such as the Cooperative Africana Microform project. In addition, the output of over fifty other microform projects is being considered for purchase.

All material within the Center is made available through interlibrary loan or photocopying. In order to make material quickly available, the Center accepts member requests by collect telephone, teletype, or telegram, as well as by United States Mail. It is claimed that material is sent out on the same day the request is received. Delivery service is maintained largely through the U. S. Mail.

The Medical Library Center

The Medical Library Center of New York, a METRO member, is an association of libraries serving the health sciences in medical schools, hospitals, medical societies and research institutions. The Center was chartered as a non-profit corporation by the Regents of the State of New York in 1959. Today it provides its members with a centralized storage and retrieval facility for seldom used materials, location and holdings on medical periodicals (Union Catalog of Medical Periodicals) and a delivery service which transports material on interlibrary loan both between the Center and its members and among the various members.

Operation of the Medical Library Center is in the hands of a Director who administers the Center and its staff of librarians and nonprofessionals. The Director is responsible to a Board of Trustees, consisting of one administrator from each sponsoring institution. Their primary concern is with financial affairs. An Advisory Committee of

Librarians acts with the Director on service and acquisition policies.

The Center is supported principally by membership dues ranging from $3,000 annually for participating institutions to $10,000 annually for sponsoring institutions. Additional support was received through grants from several foundations. These funds have been deployed for renovation of the Center's building and for the initiation of special projects, e.g. the Union Catalog of Medical Periodicals. Another source of revenue has been the rental of unused parts of the building to other organizations, including the New York Medical College and the Mount Sinai School of Medicine. Staggered short term leases provide the Center a source of income while allowing it to requisition suitable quarters for expansion as the need arises.

The Union Catalog of Medical Periodicals is a complex computer-organized union list of serials which will not be considered here, except as a possibility for a data bank for a much expanded list of serials. For the purposes of this report, attention will be focused on the Medical Library Center as a storage and retention center and the services maintained to fulfill that function. The storage facility is designed to serve two purposes. First, it is a repository for seldom used library materials in the bio-medical and health fields. This affords members a centralized point for the deposit and retrieval of this material and effectively frees their shelves of seldom used materials and insures less frequent duplication. Secondly, as a temporary storage area available for a nominal fee to libraries with projected building programs, it enables its members to continue to add to their collections without concern for immediate shelving needs. Materials housed in this manner are serviced by the Center's staff but are not available for the use of other members. Because so much of this material duplicates the Center's own holdings, the use of temporary storage is now generally discouraged.

The form and volume of deposits is not regulated by the Center. Bibliographic data is usually not submitted with the material, nor has the Center made any attempt to encourage its submission. A technical processes staff catalogs material received by author only, unless it is a duplicate or fills gaps in a serial run. Since no on-site services are provided, and all circulation is through interlibrary loan, the need for extensive subject or title cataloging is lessened. Monographs are shelved in fixed locations by size, journals alphabetically by title, and dissertations by university, year, and author. Title to material placed in this depository collection, with two exceptions, is transferred to the Center and duplicates are normally discarded. Two members are New York State agencies and are legally prohibited from transferring title of any material purchased by them.

Requests for material are received mainly through a TWX network from the Center's

sponsoring institutions and through telephone requests from participating institutions. Interlibrary loan requests are also completed for non-members, at a unit cost per transaction. Photocopying (xerox) service is maintained for requests for articles or material consisting of a small number of pages. Each member is reimbursed, on a monthly basis, for photocopies of material prepared for other members.

Delivery of material on interlibrary loan, both from the Center to its members and between members, is accomplished through the Center's delivery system, consisting of two rented trucks and two drivers employed by the Center. Member institutions are visited daily. Material for them is dropped off, and material to be delivered to other members or returned to the Center is picked up. Service is provided to the five boroughs of New York City, New Jersey, and Nassau County.

The development of both the Center for Research Libraries and the Medical Library Center has strong implications for a SHARES acquisition and retention system. Both were conceived originally as cooperative repositories for seldom used materials deposited by member libraries. Gradually, both have evolved as active agents in the acquisition of infrequently used material to be stored in their repositories for the benefit of members. Internal operations display similar parallels. Simplified cataloging (main entry card) is practised and cataloging is eliminated for whole classes of material (dissertations, college catalogs) which can be shelved in a simple alphabetical arrangement. Material is shelved by size in each depository and extensive use is made of compact shelving. Access to both collections is through interlibrary loan and both rely on other libraries to provide basic reference work.

Center for Research Libraries

Use of the Center for Research Libraries as a prototype of a shared retention system has many ramifications for a proposed similar venture for SHARES. The Center has developed over the past twelve years into a recognized cooperative institution on a national scale, able to fill member libraries' requests within twenty-four hours. The Center's holdings have grown to a substantial body of 2,600,000 volumes (1968-69) and the extent of its collection varies from old comic strips to documents relating to the Nuremberg Trials. SHARES, if it is to embark on a joint retention program, must develop as a complement to the Center for Research Libraries and must not attempt to do locally what is now done effectively on a national level. Material so infrequently used that one copy in a national archive proves sufficient should be stored in a national center for joint use. SHARES, serving as a supplement to the Center's resources, should collectively acquire and store material for which more than one copy is needed nationally. Material which might better be stored locally includes that which is infrequently used, but in sufficient demand to necessitate regional acquisition and preservation.

College catalogs are an example of infrequently used material that needs to be decentralized in more than one location. The use made of documents (municipal, state, and federal) is extensive enough to warrant assurance of complete collections in a few areas of the country. Conversely, selected foreign documents may best be left to a national cooperative facility to collect and store. Other types of material will have to be put to a similar test. Is this needed regionally or will one copy suffice, located in a national repository?

The benefits to be derived from participation in a national repository presuppose two conditions. Rapid delivery of material requested must be guaranteed, either through

interlibrary loan or photocopy fascimile. A sophisticated and sure system of delivery obviates the need for duplication of seldom used materials. The other necessity is a system or group membership for METRO in the Center for Research Libraries in order to draw on their resources.

The complexities of group membership are great and several alternate plans will be outlined here. All are dependent on the Center's willingness to accept group membership. Several formulas for METRO membership have been proposed to date. One proposal suggests METRO support for membership by the member libraries having collections and budgets which qualify them for full membership (see Appendix E). The cost to METRO for this service would vary from $66,000 to $115,000 annually, depending upon the inclusion of the three public library systems, and the number of members eligible for first class associate membership. These figures seem out of proportion to the services which might be expected.

Another possibility, and one which seems more reasonable from the standpoint of financial support and coverage, is support for the NYSILL referral centers, financed by New York State through the Division of Library Development. Since the Center for Research Libraries maintains a teletype terminal for the use of its members, requests which could not be filled by the NYSILL centers could be forwarded immediately to the Center for a search. Membership would have to be provided for a total of twelve referral centers. Eight of these centers would be entitled to full membership, and the others to the second class of associate membership.

Using the formula for CRL's current budget ($2113 plus .011811 of the book and materials budget) the cost of full membership for the eight libraries in that category would be $99,631. Second class associate memberships for the other four libraries would amount to $1046 for a total expense of $100,677. Certain referral centers could be excluded if there is a likelihood that secondary referrals by them to the Center would be a rarity.

A third possibility of sharing in the resources of the center also exists. Payments on a unit basis are permitted by the Center for each request submitted in much the same manner as NYSILL reimbursements are handled. The unit cost of this arrangement would be quite high ($100 to $300) since virtually all of the service of the Center's collection is through interlibrary loan, and would include the costs of acquisitions and processing in that figure. If referral is very limited in scope, this could be the most economical approach.

The Division of Library Development of the New York State Library is discussing

currently with the Center the feasability of NYSILL center membership and the outcome of these negotiations is not yet apparent. Whatever approach to METRO membership in the Center is adopted, experience indicates that the impetus for group membership will have to come from either METRO or the State Library. The Center has not devised any plan for group or association membership, nor do they appear inclined to do so unless pressured from outside groups. Their emphasis from the beginning has been on individual membership. The prominence of the Center for Research Libraries continues to grow. The American Council of Learned Societies recommended in 1969 that the Center be designated as the national lending library. The Center is increasingly aware of its wider responsibility to the library community and has indicated a willingness to consider proposals for group membership as long as a basis is provided for equitable treatment of their members within the current structure. METRO participation in the Center for Research Libraries is also essential if it wishes to tap into rich and unique resources that should not be duplicated in the metropolitan area.

Medical Library Center

A cost study of the Medical Library Center of New York is being completed by METRO and SADPO (the Systems Analysis and Data Processing Office of The New York Public Library). The study is being undertaken to determine storage, delivery and contractual costs for the Center and its members. Actual cost figures will be issued in The Medical Library Center: A Cost Study, METRO Miscellaneous Publication No. 6 (June 1970). Here it is necessary to examine the implications of the Medical Library Center's storage and delivery facilities for METRO and SHARES.

There are several areas of possible cooperation between METRO and the Medical Library Center. As a repository for seldom used library materials, it is already providing the types of services, although for a specialized clientele and in specific subject areas, that the SHARES Project will find necessary. The cost study will determine the financial feasibility of a METRO storage center for little used materials, using the Center as a model of a warehouse that was germinated from little more than an idea. Expansion of the Center's own services to include METRO member libraries will also be examined, as will coordination of the Center's services with those of a similar nature that may be undertaken by METRO.

The storage space available in the Center is also of potential interest to SHARES. It can serve as a model of a repository of other than medical and health materials and as a pertinent example of how such a repository is organized, serviced, and financed. If the idea of a separately-housed SHARES repository is definitely abandoned, the large

amount of space under the Medical Library Center's control presents the possibility of locating the main SHARES repository there. While an arrangement of this nature can have certain advantages (an already trained technical services staff) there are disadvantages also which need to be considered before a proposal of this nature is made. The Edelman Report proposed that a repository for seldom used, library materials be created in conjunction with The New York Public Library. This was suggested in the belief that a repository collection would be greatly enhanced if it were integrated with, or accessible to, extensive collections in the same subject areas. While there is currently no definite agreement on housing the main repository collection at The New York Public Library, there appears to be a consensus of opinion that it should be held in conjunction with a generally accessible large reference collection. In addition, the long term space needs of both the Center and a SHARES repository could possible result in a conflict at some future date.

The Center's delivery operation could be an excellent basis for a METRO-Medical Library Center cooperative project, if considered as one of a number of such services with overlapping but uncoordinated routes, e.g., delivery services of three public library systems. This could form the nucleus of a greatly expanded delivery service without an enormous outlay of METRO funds. The Center currently serves members in the five boroughs of New York, Nassau County and northern New Jersey. They have refrained from seeking members in Westchester County because of the cost of deliveries to one or two locations in that area, and since they have only one member on Staten Island, the per unit cost there is higher than is desired. A plan of coordinated routes, with a drop off point in each system would be amenable to the Medical Library Center. It would seem that METRO could, with the expenditure of considerably less than the cost of any of the individual delivery systems, and with careful planning, provide at the same time a regular service to its member systems and individuals, and the rapid delivery of material which SHARES will require to be truly effective.

Thus, it can be seen that careful consideration must be given to methods of linking METRO with both the Center for Research Libraries and the Medical Library Center. If SHARES is to embark on a retention and storage program of its own, much can be learned from studying in detail the two repositories. It is also of great importance to discuss and test means of active cooperation with these repositories. METRO has a great deal to gain in resources and services through affiliation with both centers as well as practical experience in planning a viable retention and storage system.

In addition to an action program for shared acquisitions, the Edelman Report also proposed a basic program for shared retention and storage. To evaluate how far shared retention has become an actuality through SHARES, it is necessary to re-examine each of the Edelman proposals on joint retention.

"METRO should contract with one or more libraries in its geographical area to take responsibility for the retention of last copies of certain types of material or of material in defined subject areas. This retention network will bring little used materials to those places where its usefulness will be optimal." A modest beginning has been made in this direction with the college catalog collection. Both current and non-current catalogs will be retained in an archival collection to safeguard permanent last copy retention in the metropolitan area. METRO has contracted with The New York Public Library to provide access and photocopying privileges for this collection for a fixed amount of money. In return for providing space and service, the catalogs will become the property of The New York Public Library for the use of both METRO members and the general public. An attempt is also underway to assemble periodicals, both current and retrospective, listed in the H. W. Wilson Company indexes, in one place. Considerable checking of runs, gaps in collections, etc. is necessary before an assessment can be made of the support needed to maintain such a collection.

As his second point in an action program for retention, Mr. Edelman recommended that The New York Public Library be the repository for most subject areas, excluding those not now covered by The Library's collections, e.g. medicine, law, theology. The Medical Library Center of New York is now responsible for retention of medical and health materials for twenty-three members. As has been demonstrated, a close contractual arrangement should be worked out between METRO and the Center to provide access to material in its depository. If The New York Public Library becomes the sole repository for METRO members, arrangements will have to be worked out for retention in areas outside the scope of The Library's collection policies.

At this point, it is necessary to emphasize that a retention system decentralized over a number of libraries implies the need for a strong coordinating body to insure access. Coordination is also needed for proper utilization of a system of depository libraries. The value of a central storehouse of little used material lies in one central control over access to and retention of materials. A storage policy based on integration into existing collections, building on strength will necessitate the resolution of a possible conflict of interest. Can METRO guarantee access to and proper service of a body of material housed and owned by an institution with its own policies of use? A detailed study of the advantages and disadvantages of centralized versus decentralized storage will need to be

undertaken before a final decision on a method of retention is made.

Part three of the Edelman action program for retention pointed out the need for a regional depository for United States government documents in the metropolitan area. As outlined earlier in this report, the extension of the New York State Library's function as state regional depository proved to be a more feasible arrangement. Permanent retention of all federal documents is guaranteed, relieving many METRO libraries of collecting in perpetuity. Permanent access will also be assured by dividing responsibility for on-site use, interlibrary loan and photocopying privileges among the METRO membership.

The Center for Research Libraries has been discussed earlier also, both as a model for any future SHARES repository and as a possible back-stop of subject references for New York State's NYSILL network. Mr. Edelman endorsed participation in the Center's activities. If SHARES is to serve as a repository for the member libraries of METRO, plans for its development must go hand in hand with an awareness of the Center's future plans regarding acquisition and storage. A division of responsibility between the two repositories argues for close cooperation in joint planning both on a regional and national level. SHARES, if it is to function as a regional depository of little used materials must concentrate on areas or types of material not currently being collected in such depositories as the Center for Research Libraries or the Medical Library Center.

"SHARES should explore the need for a regionally coordinated plan for preserving in some form deteriorating library materials." Techniques of deacidification and lamination are being used to conserve resources on local, regional and national levels. The uses of microtechnology in aiding the preservation of material must be explored also. SHARES, concerned with the retention of little used material, should be involved in the preservation of last copies, both in hard copy or microform. The New York metropolitan area has a heritage of unique collections and SHARES should take an active role in coordinating area resources within a plan of preservation on a national basis.

Part six of the Edelman action program proposed active weeding of smaller academic libraries to lessen their space problems, with SHARES acting as a stimulus. While it is the privilege of an individual institution to collect or discard its own resources, SHARES can serve in an advisory capacity. A centralized agency concerned with resources and retention can make member libraries aware of the strength of each other's collections, of excessive duplication in some areas, and of plans for shared retention of certain types of material. A directory of area resources, particularly those in microform or bulky and expensive sets, might be of great use. To this might be added

collecting policies of individual libraries as well as the reason for exclusion of some types of material.

The last proposal of the Edelman Report states that "a file should be developed of the need for and availability of stack space for temporary storage." This indicates that a survey should be undertaken by SHARES of the scope of METRO collections and proposed and projected library building plans as they effect individual or consolidated storage. SHARES would seem to be the logical agent for a study of the rate of growth of METRO collections, available space for expansion and future plans. The justification for joint storage cannot be made unless there is an indication of the actual need for storage.

It can be demonstrated that the recommendations of the Edelman Report regarding a SHARES retention and storage program have been initiated to a degree. Other avenues of cooperation in resources sharing and retention have been suggested for further development and testing. Before a program of shared retention becomes an actuality it is necessary to solve the questions arising from a planned program of storage. Questions that need to be asked and answered include:

1) What are the criteria for defining "seldom used" material?
2) At what point are acquisitions and cataloging functions a proper consideration of a storage center?
3) What cost factors will be involved?

Decisions must be reached on these questions before concrete plans for shared storage proceed. Basic to any decision is a study involving the selection of a method of storage - a separate facility or a concept of building on strength. Whichever course is adopted, a formula for determining what constitutes "seldom used" material must be derived. Herman H. Fussler's Patterns in the Use of Books in Large Research Libraries suggests that use is not a relevant criterion to what is discarded or retained. He states that "Many infrequently used books are absolutely essential to good research and reasonable quick access to them is essential if research is not to be impaired." The Ash-Ottemiller Report on Yale University's selective book retirement program stressed the need for a continuous assessment of the probable value of material to a subject discipline, both for current and future needs. Criteria cannot be developed solely on use. Guidelines need to be established to weed out little used material of potential research value from little used material with no foreseeable research value. Storage costs are too high to warrant physical retention of material which has outlived its usefulness.

The means of selecting material to be transferred must also be given due consideration. Transfer of substantial groups of material is more economical than transfer of selected titles, although the Yale study found it easier to recommend specific titles for storage rather than specific types of material. If material is to be shifted from one collection to another, decataloging costs enter the picture. The transfer of material, either on an individual title basis or in bulk, involves an arrangement among libraries regarding ownership of materials that will be difficult to enforce. Guaranteed access and servicing of any form of a retention plan must also be worked out. Attention must also be focused on the type of bibliographic control necessary for a storage program, since browsing privileges are virtually eliminated.

Thus it will be seen that the success of any joint storage venture is dependent upon the attention given to the solution of a number of thorny problems. Space requirements for the immediate future of METRO member libraries need to be made available. As long as space exists in individual libraries, the possibilities of a joint storage program remain dim. Before any plans for cooperative storage are considered, an evaluation of material to be stored is basic and a trial and error testing period will be needed to define specifications of items to be stored.

CONCLUSIONS

Any cooperative enterprise, such as SHARES, will be more successful in the initial stages if resources are added to a library's holdings rather than taken away. A modest beginning program of cooperative acquisitions is urged before the initiation of a wider plan of shared retention. Questionnaires concerning the scope of their college catalog collections were sent to the METRO member libraries. Subsequent telephone calls to the METRO office revealed a fear that the pooling of college catalogs would inevitably lead to a restriction of the right of libraries to collect individually. This is not true but fears need to be allayed on behalf of member libraries that cooperation inevitably leads to a reduction of their own collections. A positive approach involving the development of richer resources (shared acquisitions) should take precedence over the seemingly more negative aspect of loss of infrequently used resources (shared retention). Cooperative purchasing of resources, a more attractive prospect, can become the basis of material for shared retention or storage.

A program of cooperative acquisitions will not relieve each library's responsibility to maintain a strong collection for the use of its own community. Each institution should plan for its specific needs in the future and also for what it can rely on from other libraries. Libraries do not gain much from those books which are duplicated in other libraries. A library can and should draw on those collections in other libraries that supplement its own holdings. SHARES should serve as the agency able to insure systematic collection development among member libraries. The goal should be the reduction of overall costs and assurance of a continuous growth in total available resources.

For this purpose, a coordinating committee comprised of representative librarians, administrators, and faculty should be formed to advise and guide SHARES in resource development. METRO's new organizational pattern suggests a Committee on Resources Development. This committee is charged with the responsibility of conducting resource studies and developing a permanent machinery for coordination of acquisitions and retention of specific items or subject areas or types of material. Material defined as lesser used should be identified both for acquisition and for storage. A mechanism should be developed for the mutual purchasing and servicing of these joint endeavors. Collecting responsibilities for defined subject areas should be assigned to certain libraries. Working on a local level, considering the needs and resources of the area, this committee should be fully cognizant of regional collection development. A continuous policy of reviewing collection strengths and weaknesses will be necessary. The Committee should also be responsible for selection or rejection of material for storage as well as acquisitions.

One of the first tasks of this committee should be the production of a directory of unique

resources available in the metropolitan area. This directory could take the form of a listing by resource rather than the more traditional listing by library. It would serve as a key to expensive publications in hard copy or microform, to expensive publications available within the METRO system, thus avoiding unnecessary duplication. It could also serve as a location guide to costly or bulky materials held in some form of cooperative storage. The handbook of the Center for Research Libraries is a model of this type of publication. Resources are listed generally by form and holdings are readily apparent. A union catalog of holdings in the metropolitan area is not the desired end. What is needed is a location and availability guide to lesser used resources, which are necessary for in-depth research.

Specific Directions for SHARES

Specific recommendations of the types of resources that should be acquired jointly are discussed below. Although the emphasis is on shared acquisitions, each recommendation involves some aspect of shared retention. Indeed it is not possible to separate these two aspects of SHARES. The acquisition of material implies its retention somewhere, and the unresolved problems involving each activity need to be worked out jointly.

Microform Projects

Resources on microform loom large in any cooperative acquisitions program. Microforms are increasing in number, are frequently very expensive, and are normally not subject to heavy use. These characteristics make this form a natural one for shared acquisitions and use. The range of material available in microform is formidable. The Guide to Microforms in Print lists more than 15,000 sets. Few titles are sold on individual basis, and the potential purchaser is faced with the acquisition of an expensive set or series. Microformed material is particularly important in the consideration of any retention and storage scheme, for microreduction can reduce materials as much as 98% in terms of space requirements.

The involvement of SHARES in microform projects is twofold. As has been mentioned previously, SHARES should stimulate a survey of existing holdings among member libraries and should explore a formula for cooperative acquisitions on expensive sets. A preliminary survey of selected microform holdings is being tallied now by a group of reference librarians within METRO. SHARES should become a clearinghouse for exchanging information on the availability and location of microfilm sets. In addition, SHARES should coordinate the acquisition of expensive microform series of a lesser used nature. Where one copy of a set is all that is necessary for local needs, the advisory committee

on SHARES should determine how the resources will be acquired and where they will be deposited. As yet there is no general awareness of how widely this material is duplicated and how many libraries have current acquisition policies regarding the purchase of expensive but seldom used microforms.

There is another aspect of the new microform technology in which SHARES can play a role. Much original and unique material has been reproduced in microform. There is still a great quantity of original research material that is not available for purchase commercially and which needs to be made accessible at minimum cost on microform. The New York metropolitan area is rich in primary source materials, often in a decayed and mutilated condition. SHARES should become the agency through which resources can be preserved through microcopying and reprinting. The Center for Research Libraries, spurred on by the Association of Research Libraries, has taken the lead in this direction. Some of their projects include the Cooperative African Microform Project (CAMP), Chinese newspapers in western languages and the South Asian Microform Project (SAMP).

The filming of the Mexican Archives has often been discussed as a possible area of original microform printing on the part of METRO. A directory of the underground press in America is being prepared but is this ephemeral material available anywhere in an integrated collection? Similarly, there may be other types of material needing consolidation and preservation. SHARES, working in conjunction with the Center for Research Libraries and commercial firms, should seek out such marginal, infrequently used material which will have future value as primary source material. The unique special collections in the New York area also need systematic study, both for their physical condition and placement for maximum use.

Technical Reports

Technical reports are widely used among scientists and engineers. As a group, these reports are difficult to handle because of the large volume being issued, the complex bibliographic control and the need for quick access. The nature of the use of reports is such that one complete collection with adequate conditions of access, including photocopying, can serve a large technical population such as exists in the New York metropolitan area. Recognizing this concept, regional Technical Report Centers were organized. The Engineering Library at Columbia University was designated as a regional center. This project was financed, for a brief period of time, by the National Science Foundation. Financial support for these regional collections, including Columbia University,has subsequently been withdrawn. Users have included the Columbia University community,

industry, other colleges and the general public. The entire collection comprises approximately one-quarter million reports.

The Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, a government agency, has improved the availability of technical reports and has offered them for purchase at a relatively low cost, with the proviso that they be available to the general public. Older reports have been difficult to acquire. The collection offered by the Clearinghouse grows at the rate of some 50,000 United States reports and 25,000 translated items per year and includes about one-half million unclassified government sponsored reports.

Making the total body of these reports available in the metropolitan area in one depository collection should be one of the future projects of SHARES. Although used with some frequency, the volume and range of technical reports entails the handling and storage of much bulky material. Since Columbia University has long been a depository for reports from government agencies and has made a substantial start in the direction of a complete collection, it would seem logical to assemble and house technical reports at that institution. Financial assistance from METRO in maintaining and expanding a technical report center would assure the availability of these documents to the entire New York City community. METRO's participation would be an example of the sharing and retention of resources among member libraries. A pool of bulky materials can be organized for the benefit of those libraries which do not need to collect reports which they would seldom use. A local depository of technical and scientific reports housed and serviced in one location (Engineering Library at Columbia University) and cooperatively available to both researchers and the general public are the desired goals in the availability and dissemination of technical information.

Government Documents Collections

With the cooperation of the New York State Library, SHARES has taken measures to insure the availability of as complete a collection of federal documents as possible. State and municipal documents are represented extensively in the metropolitan area but there is no systematic coordination to insure the completeness of such a collection or prevent excessive duplication among libraries in this area. Almost all member libraries have selected representation of other than federal documents but the specific holdings of each are difficult to estimate. SHARES should stimulate the publication of an informational tool to publicize the availability of state and local documents. SHARES should also begin a survey to determine library holdings in this area, with a view to building up government document resources in either one library or dividing the responsibility of

collecting these items. Although the Center for Research Libraries collects both currently and retrospectively in the area of state and local documents, their resources are not complete. Their active collecting policy of state publications began in 1951 but they are making an attempt to fill in the retrospective gaps. Lack of personnel and space has hampered the Center from embarking on a collecting policy of city and county documents.

There would seem to be a need for as complete a collection as possible in the New York City area, without reliance on the Center for Research Libraries' rapidly expanding collections. A survey of existing area resources should be undertaken and an effort should be made to accomplish a degree of comprehensiveness here in local and state documents. This is an area where strong regional collections are necessary, and duplication is necessary because of the potential value of this resource material.

Chemical Abstracts

There is no complete collection in the New York metropolitan area (or anywhere, so far as has been determined) of all the material abstracted in Chemical Abstracts. Working together with the special and academic libraries within METRO, SHARES could insure that this material is available and retained either in one of those libraries or in a central depository. The Medical Library Center is the recipient of material abstracted in Biological Abstracts. The abstracted material already held by the center is weeded out and the remainder is processed and housed in the Center. Consolidated collections of serials from these abstracts could be worked into a centralized location for serials, e.g. Wilson-indexed periodicals. Again, a determination will have to be made of those journals adequately represented, those that fall into the seldom used category, and those which are not now held and should be acquired on a joint basis.

Photocopying Services

The nature and uses of various methods of photocopying or mechanically or electronically reproducing material is a subject for further study. Although the concern primarily of technical services, photocopying techniques are vital to the maintenance of a retention and storage center. Since browsing is rarely permitted in such a facility, the user generally knows the specific citation he is seeking and photocopying is a viable method of reproducing a journal article or chapter of a monograph. A retention center is the logical outlet for providing photocopying services, especially back-stopped with resources that are likely to be reproduced - long runs of newspapers or serials. There is a close linkage between retrieval of information and its access to the reader which

needs to be studied as part of a communication system. SHARES, concerned with the location and retrieval of resources, must also concern itself with the transmission of material.

Delivery System

A delivery system on a daily basis is a necessity also for any shared program of acquisitions and retention. Originally, as recommended in the Edelman Report, the study of the feasibility of a METRO delivery system was the charge of the SHARES project officer. METRO's new committee structure places delivery in administrative services rather than resources. In the organization of any delivery system for METRO, SHARES should serve in an advisory capacity since the successful retrieval of resources is dependent upon the successful transmission of this material. It is also vital to study existing delivery systems within METRO to determine the possibilities of an expansion of an existing delivery service.

General Recommendations

A number of specific recommendations for the future direction of SHARES has been outlined. While it is essential to continue the ongoing projects and to continue the exploration of expansion of resources, it is also essential to take a more theoretical approach to the future goals of SHARES. Projects cannot be worked out in practical detail unless problems of a far wider scope can be adequately resolved. Before a true shared acquisitions and retention program can be developed, several basic questions have to be answered. The fundamental issue, which must be settled before any forward movement on a shared basis is evident, is access to libraries and their collections. Access is defined as the availability somewhere of source materials, provision of bibliographic control of that material, identification of location and provision of that material either through on-site use, interlibrary loan, or photocopying privileges.

The needs of the smaller libraries are of great importance here. Their limited resources make it essential that they be given an outlet to libraries more fortunately endowed. A small library may only be able to make a contribution by paying fees for the services offered by other institutions. A library system, such as METRO, should act as a stimulus to smaller libraries, and at the same time, more affluent institutions should be offered the chance to tap into each other's unique collections. Study of the means of joint access, on a fee or contractual basis, will be studied by METRO's new Public Services Committee which will be concerned with use, access, and central information services.

A study in depth of the collections of METRO members is also needed, if SHARES is to develop into a viable and active force. SHARES main function likely will be to serve as a supplement to libraries with strong resources in a particular area. A qualitative as well as quantitative analysis of member libraries must be undertaken - a survey of existing books, periodicals, microforms, and other related material. This survey should cover various subject areas, the humanities and social sciences as well as the biological and physical sciences, to determine what additional resources can be acquired jointly and deposited where they will be of greatest use. An effort is needed also to determine what resources are currently needed but unavailable in this region, e.g. unfilled requests of the NYSILL network. All these studies should reveal areas where the activities of SHARES are most needed.

It must be reiterated that any future planning for SHARES must be done in relationship to the ongoing acquisition and retention policies of the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago. Whether METRO is to join this cooperative venture or continue to expand in its own direction, close attention should be paid to those resources available at the Center that might best not be duplicated elsewhere, because they are so little used or represent a great financial outlay. Similarly, other regional, national, or international programs for cooperative acquisitions and storage must be investigated for indications of future trends in acquisitions and services, as well as space requirements.

Once the shared acquisitions and retention programs of SHARES are underway, means of publicizing the resources available to METRO member libraries must be determined. The METRO newsletter and special promotional flyers are one means of transmitting information. A word-of-mouth campaign is even more satisfactory. It is recommended that the SHARES staff visit and talk to the libraries concerned, informing them of what is available through SHARES and reassuring them that cooperative acquisition and retention does not interfere with their own internal collection policies. An active program of public relations is vital to encourage joint cooperation, followed by an active publicity drive to emphasize the resources now available.

The long term goals for SHARES may be defined as the cooperative acquisition of material, storage of infrequently used material, exploration of the needs for microform projects, and provision of access to materials through a service program. Those projects which have been initiated, e.g. college catalog collection, a clearinghouse for U. S. government documents, a central location for Wilson-indexed periodicals, must be given a valid testing period to ascertain whether they are financially feasible and used by by member libraries. Before any new projects are considered and developed, this report has emphasized the need for further study of METRO area resources, of the

frequency of use of these resources, of future expansion plans, and of storage needs. A cautionary approach is urged before any great financial commitments are made because of the unique problems of access and use inherent in the libraries of the New York metropolitan area.

ACRONYMS

ARL	Association of Research Libraries
CAMP	Cooperative African Microform Project
CASC	Cooperative Acquisition and Storage Project
CRL	The Center for Research Libraries
CUNY	The City University of New York
DASC	Delayed Access Storage Center
LACAP	Latin American Cooperative Acquisitions Plan
METRO	New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency
MLC	The Medical Library Center
NYPL	The New York Public Library
NYSILL	New York State Interlibrary Loan
SADPO	Systems Analysis and Data Processing Office of The New York Public Library
SAMP	South Asian Microform Project
SHARES	Shared Acquisitions and Retention System
SUNY	State University of New York

2

APPENDICES

A Interlibrary Cooperation - a Chronology

B Depository Libraries in METRO Area

C Letter from Superintendent of Documents

D H. W. Wilson Company Indexes - Tabulation of Mid-Manhattan Holdings

E METRO Libraries Eligible for CRL Membership

Appendix A

Interlibrary Cooperation

A Chronology

1599 Interlibrary loans in Germany

1896 A preliminary scheme for the relation between Columbia University and The New York Public Library for the development of libraries and the purchase of books

1899 Library of Congress printed cards

1902 Harvard plan for central storage to meet growth problems

1910 ALA study of coordination of college library work

1942 New England Deposit Library

1946 New York Metropolitan Committee of Librarians

1947 Proposal for a Northeastern Regional Library

1948/49 Committee activities

1950 Keyes Metcalf, Carl White papers at NYLA

1952 Committee of Trustees of institutions involved asked for preliminary exploration by firm of consultants. Cresap, McCormick and Paget report issued in October

1948 Farmington Plan - divided responsibility for collecting foreign materials

1950 State-supported federated systems of public libraries in New York State

1951 Midwest Inter-Library Center, later the Center for Research Libraries

1952 Cresap, McCormick and Paget report (cf. 1947)

1953 Regents' Committee on Integration of College and University Library Resources in New York State

1957 Council of Higher Educational Institutions in New York City formed 1959 - Library consultant hired and library research program undertaken

1958 Metropolitan College Inter-Library Association formed

1959 Medical Library Center incorporated

1960 Commissioner's Committee on Reference and Research Library Resources - Interim report

Council of Higher Educational Institutions in New York City - Cooperative Library Service for Higher Education-A Library Research Program-New York

First 3 R's bill presented to New York State Legislature

Interlibrary Cooperation - Continued

A Chronology

1961 Formal report of Commissioner's Committee on 3 R's
1962 Ad Hoc Committee of Librarians in New York City
1963 Nelson Associates, Inc. surveys - New York City, Brooklyn, New York State
Academic Libraries of Brooklyn formed
1964 New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency (METRO) chartered
1966 - CLR grant - March
Staff - July
Membership meeting - December
1967 - Telefacsimile experiment begun - January
Expanded staff and program - fall
1965 First Governor's Library Conference, June 24-25, Albany
1966 Funds requested in Governor's executive budget and $700,000 allocated to State Education Department for 3 R's for fiscal 1967

Appendix B

Depository Libraries in METRO Area

Queens Borough Public Library
St. John's University (Jamaica)
Queens College
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
Pratt Institute
Brooklyn Public Library
SUNY - Maritime College Library
Cooper Union Library
The New York Public Library
New York University - Washington Square
New York University - University Heights
City College
College of Insurance
New York Law Institute Library
Columbia University
Herbert H. Lehman College
Hunter College
Fordham University
Medical Research Library of Brooklyn
Brooklyn College
Wagner College
SUNY - College at Purchase
Yonkers Public Library
Sarah Lawrence College
Mount Vernon Public Library

DIVISION OF
PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20402

November 10, 1969

Mr. Mason Tolman
Director, The New York State Library
The University of The State of New York
The State Education Department
Albany, N. Y. 12224

Dear Mr. Tolman:

Thank you for your letter of November 5 notifying this Office of your intention to extend the area of service of your library as a Regional Depository, to include New York City.

I am very glad that you are able to assume this additional responsibility. It will be of tremendous advantage to the New York City libraries which have not had the service of a Regional Library heretofore. This is just one more indication of the outstanding job being done by your library under provisions of the current depository law. I find that I am using it more and more as a model, in discussions of Regional problems that we have with libraries throughout the country.

Please call on me whenever we can help you. I wish you every success in your new undertaking.

Sincerely yours,

Carper W Buckley

CARPER W. BUCKLEY
Superintendent of Documents

Appendix D

H. W. Wilson Company Indexes

(% of titles held by Mid-Manhattan Library as of July, 1969)

Indexes	(approximate) No. of Titles	Mid-Manhattan Coverage
Applied Science & Technology Index	225	76.2
Art Index	150	10.9
Biological & Agricultural Index	150	50.34
Business Periodicals Index	170	97
Education Index	241	52.3
Index to Legal Periodicals	300	4.18
Library Literature	175	20.12
Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature	160	98.7
Social Sciences & Humanties Index	205	99

Appendix E

METRO member libraries eligible for full membership in the Center for Research Libraries:

Name	Volumes (as of Sept. 1969)
City College	731,069
Columbia University	3,675,920
Fordham University	818,116
New York University	2,031,287
The New York Public Library (Research)	4,662,326
The New York Public Library (Branch System)	3,231,696
Brooklyn Public Library	2,691,279
Queens Borough Public Library	2,281,861

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Council of Learned Societies. *Report on cooperation between the New York Public Library, the City University of New York and the State University of New York.* New York, 1968.

American Council of Learned Societies. Committee on Research Libraries. *On research libraries; statement and recommendations, submitted to National Advisory Commission on Libraries.* Cambridge, Mass., M.I.T. Press, 1969.

Ash, Lee. *Yale's selective book retirement program; report of a three year project directed by John H. Ottemiller, Associate University Librarian.* Hamden, Conn., Anchor Books, 1963.

CASC: A preliminary study. (Report on a Cooperative Acquisitions and Storage Center for METRO, prepared by students of the School of Library Service, Columbia University). New York, 1968.

Center for Research Libraries, Chicago. *Handbook.* Chicago, 1969.

Center for Research Libraries, Chicago. *The report of a survey with an outline of programs and policies.* Chicago, 1965.

Clapp, Verner, W. Public libraries and the network idea. *Library Journal,* 95: 121-124. (1970)

A cooperative program to provide improved research library services to the City and State of New York. Proposed by: The Commissioner of Education of the State of New York, The Chancellor of the City University of New York, The Chancellor of the State University of New York, The President of the New York Public Library. New York, 1968.

Cory, John Mackenzie. The network in a major metropolitan center (METRO), New York). *Library Quarterly,* 39: 90-98. (1969).

Cresap, McCormick and Paget. *The growth problem in research libraries of the Northeast. A preliminary review.* New York, 1952.

Edelman, Hendrik. *Shared Acquisitions and Retention System (SHARES) for the New York metropolitan area; A proposal for cooperation among METRO libraries.* New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency, 1969. (METRO Miscellaneous Publication No. 3)

Estes, Rice. *A study of seven academic libraries in Brooklyn and their cooperative potential.* New York, Council of Higher Educational Institutions in New York City, 1963.

Felter, Jacqueline W. The Medical Library Center of New York. A progress report. *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association*, 56: 15-20. (1968)

Fussler, Herman H. and Julian L. Simon. *Patterns in the use of books in large research libraries*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Harrar, Helen J. Cooperative storage warehouses. *College and Research Libraries*, 25: 37-42 (1964)

Knight, Douglas M. and E. Shepley Nourse, editors. *Libraries at large*. New York, R. R. Bowker and Company, 1970.

Meyerhoff, Erich. The Medical Library Center of New York: an experiment in cooperative acquisition and storage of medical library materials. *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association*, 51: 501-506. (1963)

Nelson Associates, Inc. *Prospects for library cooperation in New York City: planning for more effective utilization of reference and research resources*. New York, 1963.

Nelson Associates, Inc. *Strengthening and coordinating reference and research resources in New York State*. New York, 1963.

New York (State) University. Education Department. *Federal depository library service in New York State*. Albany, 1964.

New York (State) Education Department. Division of Library Development. *Improving reference and research library resources in New York State*. Albany, 1965.

New York (State) University. Commissioner's Committee on Reference and Research Library Resources. *Report of the Commissioner's Committee on Reference and Research Library Resources to James E. Allen, Jr., Commissioner of Education*. Albany, 1961.

Orne, Jerrold. Storage and Deposit Libraries. In *The State of the Library Art* edited by Ralph R. Shaw. New Brunswick, Rutgers University, 1960.

Shank, Russell. *Regional access to scientific and technical information: A program for action in the New York metropolitan area*. New York, New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency, 1968. (METRO Miscellaneous Publication No. 1)

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

OFFICERS

President - Dr. Maurice L. Tainter
Vice President - Dr. E. J. Schonleber
Secretary - Dr. Morris A. Gelfand
Treasurer - Miss Frances Friscia

MEMBERS

Mr. Donald C. Anthony
Mr. Milton Byam
Professor Leon Edel
Mr. John C. Frantz
Mr. Edward G. Freehafer
Dr. Charles F. Gosnell
Mr. Laurence G. Hill
Mr. James Humphry III
Mr. John C. McPherson
Dr. Carroll V. Newsom
Brother Alexander F. Thomas
Mr. Harold W. Tucker
Mrs. Elizabeth R. Usher
Dr. May V. K. Valencik
Dr. F. Joachim Weyl
Mr. Bill M. Woods

METRO SECRETARIAT

Dr. Richard H. Logsdon, Executive Director
L. Dawn Pohlman, Assistant Executive Director
Marion L. Simmons, Assistant Executive Director
Faye Simkin, SHARES - Project Officer
Elizabeth E. Bentley, Reference Specialist
Dorothy S. Petersen, Secretary
Michele M. Linker, Secretary
Virginia M. Constantine, Technical Assistant

METRO MEMBER LIBRARIES

American Museum of Natural History
Bank Street College of Education
Barnard College
Briarcliff College
Brooklyn College of Pharmacy
Brooklyn Public Library
Center for Inter-American Relations, Inc.
Chemists' Club
The City University of New York
- Borough of Manhattan Community College
- Brooklyn College
- City College
- Graduate Studies Division
- Herbert H. Lehman College
- Hunter College
- New York City Community College
- Queens College
- Queensborough Community College

College of New Rochelle
Columbia University
Council on Foreign Relations
Council on Research in Bibliography, Inc.
Engineering Societies Library
Finch College
Ford Foundation
Fordham University
Good Counsel College
The Interpublic Group of Companies, Inc.
Iona College
The King's College
Long Island University
Manhattan College
Manhattanville College
Mary Rogers College
Maryknoll Seminary
Marymount College
Marymount Manhattan College
Medical Library Center of New York
Mercy College
Metropolitan Museum of Art
Montclair State College
The New York Botanical Gardens
The New York Public Library
New York Society Library
New York University
Newark State College
Notre Dame College of Staten Island
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
Pratt Institute
Queens Borough Public Library
St. John's University
St. Peter's College
Sarah Lawrence College
The State University of New York
- College at Purchase
- Maritime College
- Medical Research Library of Brooklyn

Teachers College
Westchester Library System
White Plains Public Library
Yeshiva University
Yonkers Public Library